

MISSISSIPPI

Robert M. Fisher, Jr., Bucatunna.
Sadie I. Still, Clarksdale.
Robert L. Gray, Corinth.
Hubert B. Scrivener, Maben.

MISSOURI

Gertrude L. Duke, Dadeville.
Lester F. Bain, Farnfeldt.
Robert W. Rodgers, Hornersville.
James E. Karr, Iberia.
Paul A. Davidson, Ilmo.
Helen E. Jameson, McFall.
Edgar W. Holt, Ozark.
Carl B. Hardin, Raymondville.
Charles N. Bruton, Rosebud.
Frank S. Evans, South West City.
Adrian J. D. Ockerby, Wentworth.
Edna M. Duckett, Williamsville.

MONTANA

Philetus C. Lapham, Malta.

NEBRASKA

Frank C. Diehl, Bassett.

NEW JERSEY

Harry L. Willits, Beach Haven.

NEW YORK

Alice M. Maloney, Ausable Chasm.
John M. Keyes, Buffalo.
William A. Bramer, Clyde.
Mary N. Seamans, East Pembroke.
Charles J. O'Connell, Elmira.
Jeanette R. Bye, Highland Lake.
Evelyn B. Dailey, Prospect.
James P. Boyd, Ray Brook.
William G. Britton, Rensselaerville.
Catherine G. Rieger, Shenorock.
David L. Hoy, Sidney Center.
Margaret Zimmons, Somers.
Constant L. Proskine, South Kortright.
Jennie M. James, Tomkins Cove.
Henry W. Haynes, Whiteface.

NORTH CAROLINA

Harry L. Adams, Lake Lure.
W. Henry Lomax, Linwood.

OHIO

Ned Stiger, Bradner.
Robert J. Schwing, Cleves.
Thomas E. Sexton, Groveport.
Olive A. Ruble, Haydenville.
Mary E. Derry, Jaitte.
Howard R. Poole, Londonderry.
Edison Blackburn, Malta.
Stewart K. Nighswander, Maple Grove.
Marjorie C. Rees, Medway.
Elaine D. Severn, Mendon.
Frank Edwin Treon, Miamisburg.
Joseph Yanka, New Washington.
Ruth E. Sherwood, Oregonia.
Herald W. Mougey, Rittman.
Hobart E. Morehead, Rushville.
Paul F. Spillman, Waynesfield.
Warren E. Snyder, West Alexandria.
James F. Smith, Wilmington.
Edwin E. Rawdon, Windsor.
J. Paul Orsborn, Zanesfield.

OKLAHOMA

Kinley Case, Paden.

OREGON

Robert E. Richter, Camas Valley.
Alma M. Elliott, Chiloquin.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert Elton MacKissic, Parker Ford.

RHODE ISLAND

Bruce J. Stokes, Forestdale.
LeRoy E. Davis, Greene.
Hazel E. Durand, Hope.
Bertha J. Huntley, Longmeadow.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edmund P. Grice, Jr., Charleston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wenzel G. Huebl, White Lake.

TENNESSEE

Sam P. Gammon, Fordtown.
Robert B. Pitts, Hixson.

XCIII—621

TEXAS

John D. Hendricks, Cooper.
Hardy R. Hancock, Jasper.
Jeff T. Graham, Knox City.
Donald M. Hackney, Sunset Heights.

VERMONT

Vera R. Perkins, Quechee.

VIRGINIA

Daniel William Moffett, Warrenton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Longacre.
Brady F. Randolph, Sutton.

WISCONSIN

Edward H. Belz, Athens.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. S. R. Pitts, S. J., principal of St. Joseph's College High School, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Lord, we know that You are the God of peace. This You have told us in many ways. On the first Christmas night the angels sang Your message, "On earth peace to men of good will." The Divine Son told us, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled nor let it be afraid."

But our hearts are troubled by the break-up of so many American homes, by the unrest that exists among so many of our youth, by the strife that separates employer from employee, and by war and the rumor of war that troubles the nations.

Humbly do we beg divine guidance and strength upon our President and these our legislators in the midst of such anxieties. May the blessing of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit descend upon them and remain with them forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1317) entitled "An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CORDON, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. HATCH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3587) entitled "An act to establish a

National Aviation Council for the purpose of unifying and clarifying national policies relating to aviation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 51, entitled "Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947," it was—

Resolved, That the above-entitled concurrent resolution be not agreed to.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey; and

S. 526. An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3613) to amend sections 1802 (a), 1802 (b), and 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1802 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by deleting the period at the end of the next to the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "": *Provided further*, That where such certificates (or shares, where no certificates are issued) are issued in a recapitalization, the tax payable shall be that proportion of the tax computed on such certificates or shares issued in the recapitalization that the amount dedicated as capital for the first time by the recapitalization, whether by a transfer of earned surplus or otherwise, bears to the total par value (or actual value if no-par stock) of such certificates or shares issued in the recapitalization."

Section 1802 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after the first proviso the following: "*Provided further*, That upon any transfer of an interest in a partnership owning shares or certificates of stock, the tax shall be limited to an amount equal to that percentage of a tax computed on the transfer of all of such shares or certificates of stock owned by the partnership as the interest transferred bears to the total interests in the partnership of all the partners:"

Section 1802 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting in the second proviso following the word "deposited" a comma and the words "nor upon mere loans of stock."

Section 3481 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after "*Provided*" the following: "*further*, That upon any transfer of an interest in a partnership owning such instrument, the tax shall be limited to an amount equal to that percentage of a tax computed on the transfer of all of such instruments owned by the partnership as the interest transferred bears to the total interests in the partnership of all the partners: *Provided further*."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 20, strike out "*further*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would correct certain inequities in the law providing for stamp and documentary taxes on capital stock and bonds.

It comes with a unanimous report from the Ways and Means Committee and the approval of the Treasury Department.

At present, if a corporation recapitalizes, all stock—old and new—bears a stamp tax. Under this bill, the tax would apply only to the new capital introduced.

Again, in case of the death or withdrawal of a partner, all securities owned by the firm are subject to a stock-transfer tax even if his interest in the firm is only a minor one. Under this bill the tax would apply only to a share of the partnership securities which is proportional to his interest in the firm.

Again, the bill exempts from the tax mere loans of stock. New York State, where most security transactions take place, has never seen fit to tax such loans.

The present law penalizes many persons selling stock who, owing to the distance of their home from the New York Stock Exchange, cannot make physical delivery promptly.

The tax was imposed in 1932 before there was any Securities and Exchange Commission in an effort to discourage short selling, but it has had no such effect and has proved just a nuisance.

The Securities and Exchange Commission which now has responsibility for these matters has no objection to the passage of the bill. I quote from a letter received by me, dated June 19, 1947, from Robert K. McConaughy, Acting Chairman of the Commission:

It is our opinion that the tax, which aggregates no more than 5 or 6 cents per share, does not have any significant effect in deterring short sales, and that its repeal would not have any significant effect in encouraging short sales. We regard the bill, therefore, as a revenue measure not involving policy considerations under the statutes we administer.

Passage of this bill will cause but an insignificant loss of revenue and will remove inequities.

GILA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1597) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in reference to this bill I took the matter up with the Department of the Interior, and find out that there are 110,000 acres which the gentleman from Arizona is going to have re-

leased if they take on these 75,000 acres on this project, and they will not expect the Federal Government to take and irrigate the 110,000 acres, and I would like to have the gentleman, if this bill goes through by unanimous consent, make that statement on the floor in order that the Department of the Interior may know that they are not supposed to take and irrigate the 110,000 acres which they are now giving up.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. Under the terms of this bill the 110,000 acres in the original project lying higher up on the mesa near Yuma will be eliminated from the project, and in lieu thereof 75,000 acres of bottom land will be substituted for the larger area eliminated, thus making a better project.

Mr. RICH. That is correct, and that is what the Department of the Interior would like to have accomplished.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 68,000 irrigable acres of land situate on the Yuma Mesa and within the North and South Gila Valleys and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That the waters to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion and storage thereof, shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to and controlled by the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, New Mexico, November 24, 1922.*

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however,* That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District, of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed \$380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded, warrant, and other outstanding indebtednesses.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United

States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided,* That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of no more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (1) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (2) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however,* That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further,* That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period of years as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicated the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligation to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 40,000 irrigable acres of land (25,000 acres thereof situated on the Yuma Mesa and 15,000 acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land, or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and is hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That the waters to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion, transportation, delivery, and storage thereof, shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922: *And provided further,* That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however,* That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District, of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and deter-

mined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed \$380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded warrant and other outstanding indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided,* That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of not more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (1) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (2) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however,* That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further,* That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land-sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicated the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligations to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the char-

acter of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

RELOCATE BOUNDARIES AND REDUCE AREA OF GILA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 483) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 40,000 irrigable acres of land (25,000 acres thereof situated on the Yuma Mesa and 15,000 acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land, or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and is hereby authorized: *Provided, however,* That the water to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion, transportation, delivery, and storage thereof,

shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922: *And provided further*, That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however*, That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed \$380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded warrant, and other outstanding indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided*, That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of not more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (1) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (2) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes and to all proceedings for

the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however*, That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further*, That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land-sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period, not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicated the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligation to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of sub-normal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURDOCK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 1597 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1597) was laid on the table.

RECORDS FURNISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend section 1 of the act of August

24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, after "distribution," insert "The money received for copies under this section shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriations then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies as herein authorized."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one under the title of "The West Against Itself" and the other "Conservation of Our Natural Resources."

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram on the wool bill.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the new Speaker of the House for having the national deficit cut down so that we have a credit balance of \$753,000,000 this year—the first time in 16 years. I have kept a record of the Treasury statements—here they are, several hundred of them. If there are any doubting Thomases around here, I have the proof for these statements. They come from the Treasury Department. Never in the history of our country or any other country in the world have we seen anything like the spending and the debt we have piled up since 1931. I am placing here a table showing, since 1914, the total net receipts and the total expenditures—each year since 1914—the public debt, and the amount of the deficits. It will be interesting to many of you to go back over that record. In the future, the gentleman from Massachusetts,

Speaker MARTIN, and the Republican Party, are going to do everything possible to cut down and wipe out the national debt that has been created in the last 14 years.

TABLE 1.—U. S. Government budget receipts, expenditures, and public debt, 1914-47

(Amounts in millions)

Year ended June 30—	Total net receipts	Total net expenditures	Net surplus or deficit (—)	Public debt June 30
1914	\$735	\$735	0	\$1,188
1915	698	761	—\$63	1,191
1916	782	734	48	1,225
1917	1,124	1,977	—853	2,976
1918	3,664	12,097	—9,033	12,244
1919	5,152	18,515	—13,363	25,482
1920	6,635	6,403	232	24,299
1921	5,625	5,116	509	22,977
1922	4,109	3,373	736	22,963
1923	4,007	3,295	712	22,350
1924	4,012	3,049	963	21,251
1925	3,780	3,063	717	20,516
1926	3,963	3,098	865	19,643
1927	4,129	2,974	1,155	18,512
1928	4,042	3,103	939	17,604
1929	4,033	3,299	734	16,931
1930	4,178	3,440	738	16,185
1931	3,190	3,652	—462	16,801
1932	2,006	4,535	—2,529	19,487
1933	2,080	3,864	—1,784	22,539
1934	3,116	6,011	—2,895	27,053
1935	3,800	7,010	—3,210	28,701
1936	4,116	8,666	—4,550	33,779
1937	5,029	8,177	—3,148	36,425
1938	5,855	7,239	—1,384	37,165
1939	5,165	9,027	—3,862	40,440
1940	5,387	9,297	—3,910	42,968
1941	7,607	13,765	—6,158	48,961
1942	12,799	34,290	—21,491	72,422
1943	22,282	70,702	—48,420	136,696
1944	44,149	95,573	—51,424	201,003
1945	46,457	107,398	—60,941	258,682
1946	43,038	63,714	—20,676	269,422
1947	43,288	42,505	783	255,857

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am not a doubting Thomas, but there is one thing I do not doubt; that is, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of the most diligent, useful, and consistent Members of this House.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman very much. His statement is appreciated, I am sure. All I want to do is try to cut down the debt and balance the budget, so we can pay this great debt. I also add here, too, table 2, showing the budget and comparison for 1939 and 1948:

TABLE 2.—Budget expenditures by major programs

(Amounts in millions)

	1939	1948
National defense	\$1,074	\$11,256
Veterans' service and benefits	559	7,343
Interest on the public debt	941	5,000
International affairs and finance	19	3,510
Refunds of tax receipts	68	2,065
Social welfare, health, and security	3,996	1,654
Transportation and communication	512	1,530
General government	556	1,492
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1,198	1,381
Natural resources	214	1,101
Housing and community facilities	1,154	539
Finance, commerce, and industry	52	425
Labor	11	118
Education and general research	44	88
Reserve for contingencies	163	25
Adjustment to daily statement basis	163	25
Total expenditures	9,027	37,528

¹ Excess of credits, deduct.

We must cut down on our expenditures. Be wise and economize.

VETERANS' SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is preparing to close Saturday. We still have some very important veterans' legislation pending. I refer especially to the legislation involving subsistence allowances. I have been hammering away all during the last Congress and this one to do something about increasing the subsistence allowances of veterans going to school under the GI bill. We have reported this legislation out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Now that the other body has acted on this matter, I am wondering if this House is going to adjourn without taking action upon this very important question.

I offered a bill last year to increase the subsistence allowances for students and I reintroduced my bill this year. The Veterans' Affairs Committee has held exhaustive hearings on the subject and formally reported one bill to increase the allowances and today reported another bill, which latter bill, I understand, is exactly in line with the bill on the same subject which passed the Senate last Saturday.

The high cost of living has made it difficult, and in some cases perhaps impossible, for veterans who do not have independent means to go to school. I want all veterans who are eligible under the GI bill to get the fullest possible benefits of the educational feature of the act. That is why I have so consistently and persistently sought to get the subsistence allowance increased.

This Congress ought not to adjourn without passing this legislation. The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee indicates that she is ready to call this legislation up for action at any time, if the House leadership will recognize her for that purpose. I sincerely hope that the distinguished Speaker will recognize the chairman of the committee to call up this legislation. The time is very short and I appeal to the leadership to see that this legislation is passed and sent to the White House before adjournment.

LOYALTY INVESTIGATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, before this Congress adjourns Saturday, I think the Committee on Appropriations should bring in and pass money for the President's loyalty investigation. The sum of \$25,000,000 has been asked for to complete this effort to remove Communists and other subversive elements from the pay roll of the United States Government.

President Truman asked for these investigative funds to carry out this housecleaning more than 3 months ago—but so far none have been appropriated for this extremely important work to safeguard our Government from these subversive groups.

This work is going forward but in a limited way. With adequate funds available, far more progress can be made and the job can be properly done. It cannot progress any further now unless these funds are appropriated before the Congress adjourns.

If we mean business in getting rid of these Reds, I think the least we can do is give the President's committee on loyalty the money necessary to conduct these investigations. If we do not, since the loyalty bill the House passed the other day will not become law for at least 6 or 8 months, we will be delayed for six or more precious months.

Give the President the money to start this work, even though this legislation, which was passed by the House recently, has not become law.

Numerous editorials in the New York Times, the Washington News, the New York Herald Tribune, and other papers have cast doubt on the wisdom of the legislation passed by the House. Lack of adequate safeguards for old employees of the Government who are loyal have been challenged in the House bill.

Little criticism has been heard of the President's loyalty investigative program because of the adequate safeguards it provides. It was a carefully worked out program, designed not only to ferret out the Reds, but also to protect the rights and the good names of the loyal and innocent workers from slander and irresponsible gossip.

This program is under way—it is now in operation. It will cease to function unless funds are appropriated before adjournment. The danger of a 6- or 8-month delay to await action on the doubtful House-passed measure is a risk this Nation cannot afford to take at this critical time.

SUBVERSIVE AND DISLOYAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Oklahoma that we should appropriate money for the President to carry out his loyalty program.

I submit also that whenever a man is fired from the Federal payroll for disloyalty his name should be sent to the Congress of the United States. What right have we to throw these Reds out of the State Department or other departments, and turn them loose and let them go back and get on the State pay rolls or in other responsible positions and continue their subversive activities?

All these men who have been thrown off the Federal pay roll for disloyalty or for subversive activities should be known to the American people, because

unless that is done they will go right back into the various States and continue their subversive activities.

I hope we will not only appropriate the money the President asked for, but also money to carry out the loyalty legislation that we pass, and at the same time, I hope the administration will send to the Congress the name of every person who is thrown off the Federal pay roll for disloyalty or for subversive activities.

MUCH-NEEDED LEGISLATION

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my two-bits, for whatever it may be worth, to emphasize and heartily concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. May I insist also, that we refuse to recess or adjourn until we have passed each of the other 11 important pieces of national legislation.

I want to call attention to the cartoon which appeared in the Post a couple of days ago depicting Congress getting out of an automobile that it had been driving called Needed Legislation with three or four beautiful ladies called Pieces of Needed Legislation in it. As the train was bearing down the track upon them the chauffeur tipped his hat and said, "This is my train" and left them to their death.

I submit that we have no right to quit until we do our job.

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 320, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That TOM PICKETT, of the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by W. G. Vollmer.

THE UNIFICATION BILL

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the RECORD in the Appendix at page A3702 an editorial of the Chicago Daily Tribune with respect to the unification bill. I desire to read one paragraph of the editorial which I would like very much to have the Members read in full. The paragraph is as follows:

Third, the Executive order by which President Truman proposes to implement the leg-

islation provides for the use of "such missions and detachments for service in foreign countries as may be required to support the national policies and interests of the United States." Language so vague is subject to alarming constructions. There is no authorization here that Congress is to be consulted if the President is persuaded by the Army and Navy to get into military adventures and nondeclared wars anywhere on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that steps should be taken to remedy that situation.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. And that is in line with the suggestion contained in the amendment which the gentleman offered at the time of the debate last week.

Mr. OWENS. Yes; it is. I am not trying to die hard on the voice vote, but I believe that, with respect to the amendment which I offered—as a matter of fact, I think the Chair should have decided in favor of it—some action should be taken to the end that Congress will not close its own avenue to information.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time because I see my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on the floor. He is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. On July 11 the President approved the bill in relation to retirement for agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We are all acquainted with that.

I notice the bill H. R. 4127 passed the House the other day. It has been called to my attention that the provisions of that bill might raise legal complications in relation to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I know that is farthest removed from the minds of any of us, and particularly the gentleman from Kansas. When the matter goes to conference or in the other body, I hope that language which will clarify that situation will be inserted in H. R. 4127.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts that some question has been raised as to whether or not the retirement bill will affect that legislation. In any event, the gentleman from Kansas has been before the Senate committee and explained the situation there, and in the event the retirement bill is passed by the Senate, which we expect it will do, an amendment will be included to take care of the particular problem to which the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an article.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

LOYALTY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the suggestion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] with regard to providing funds, that the President long ago requested, to implement his program of loyalty investigation.

As chairman of a subcommittee in the Civil Service Committee in the last Congress, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] were members, our studies and the recommendations of the Civil Service Committee, of which the Hon. Jennings Randolph was then chairman, led to the promulgation of that order of the President. This report will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, July 20, 1946, on page 9601.

The Presidential order sets up adequate machinery for screening employees and prospective employees of the Government. It would empower the Civil Service Commission to investigate prospective employees and the FBI to make name checks and investigate persons already in the employ of the Government suspected of disloyalty. The order sets up adequate safeguards for the public interest on the one hand and the rights of Government employees on the other. A uniform system of procedures with adequate rights of appeal and review are provided in the order. To carry on the work properly will require an enlargement of the investigative staffs of both the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The President long ago requested an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to defray the cost of this work. We ought to implement his program by providing the funds before this Session of Congress adjourns and I trust that it will be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

INVITATION TO ATTEND THE BAHAMAS HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,
Bahamas, July 4, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Member of Congress, Speaker of the
House of Representatives, Speaker's
Office, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D. C., U. S. A.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER MARTIN: As Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Parliament of Bahamas and joint president of the Bahamas Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, I am writing to you to extend an invitation for four Members of your House of Representatives to visit the Bahamas for a period of about 10 days from December 28 next, as guests of the Bahamas branch of the association.

During that time the Bahamas branch will be the hosts in the Colony to delegations of members of all parties from the Parliaments of the United Kingdom and the Dominion of Canada. It is hoped also to have representatives of the Parliaments of the Australian Commonwealth, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

The Bahamas branch of the association were much impressed with the success of the informal parliamentary gathering which took place in Bermuda last year, at the invitation of the Bermuda branch of the association. The value of the parliamentary contacts and interchange of views which took place in Bermuda, and also in Washington, when the delegates visited the Capitol as the guests of the Congress of the United States, were fully appreciated by members of this legislature; and they would propose, if this invitation is accepted, to provide opportunities during the visit to Nassau for the discussion of some matters of common interest at informal conferences.

I can assure you that if it is found possible to accept this invitation, which I very much hope will be the case, the representatives of your House will receive a warm welcome from the Parliament and people of these islands.

I take the opportunity of expressing to you my feelings of deep respect and of extending to you my most cordial greetings.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) ASA H. PRITCHARD,
Member, House of Assembly; Speak-
er, House of Assembly; and Joint
President of the Bahamas Branch
of the Empire Parliamentary As-
sociation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I submit a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Senate and the House of Representatives hereby accept the invitations tendered by the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly of the Bahamas Government to have four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives attend a meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association to be held in the Bahamas beginning December 28, 1947. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend such meeting and are further authorized to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses. The

expenses incurred by the members of the delegations appointed for the purpose of attending such meeting, which shall not exceed \$5,000 for each of the delegations, shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is this resolution debatable?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may reserve the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice arrangements are being made to send committees of Congress all over the world to try to find out what is going on. I make the suggestion that we make arrangements to get Members to go back home and see what the American people are having to go through now, and find out what they are thinking about.

This running around all over the globe to find out what somebody else is thinking beyond the boundaries of the United States, and particularly behind the iron curtain, is just about worn threadbare. It seems to me the Members of the Congress should go back home and find out what the American people are thinking about.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Please accept this as my resignation from the House Committee on Agriculture.

Very truly yours,

CLIFF CLEVINGER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Respectfully,

ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Public Works Committee of the House.

Appreciating the many courtesies extended, I am

Most sincerely,

WAT ARNOLD,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 321) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That CLIFF CLEVINGER, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 322) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That WAT ARNOLD, of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 323) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That RUSSELL V. MACK, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a statement by Joseph A. Engelhard, and in the other to include a historical sketch. The latter might exceed the limit under the rules, but notwithstanding that fact, I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on flood control.

EXTENDING THE PERIOD FOR PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN WAR-INCURRED SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 279, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 279 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3682 under an open rule and provides for 1 hour general debate. The bill, H. R. 3682, is a measure to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollment.

The necessity for this assistance is not as great as it has been in the past, but due to the great housing shortage that has persisted in this country we do have, near many of the former war plants and Army and Navy installations throughout the country, great Government-owned housing projects which have brought with them a tremendous increase in the enrollment in the schools in those particular portions of our districts. During the war, and since the war, these school children have been attending the schools in many particular districts which have much less tax income than before the war simply because much of the taxable property of the township or the school district, as I am sure many of you know from your own experiences, has been taken over by the Government and is no longer taxed. So, today we have quite a number of school districts where the pupil enrollment is much greater than it has ever been before, while at the same time the tax income of the school district is much lower than it has ever been before. In order to take care of this temporary situation during the war we did spend considerable money out of the Federal Treasury to help support those schools and to take care of the children of war workers and Army and Navy personnel.

There has been a great decline in that assistance need, but, as I said a moment ago, because of the housing shortage many of these publicly owned housing facilities are still being occupied, even though the war plant itself may have been shut down or reconverted to some other sort of production. We have instances where men who have found employment as far as 50 or 60 miles away, still having to have a home for their children, are still residing in these war-housing installations. It is not thought it will take a great deal of money—in fact, this bill limits the total expenditure to \$5,000,000—to continue this aid to these particular school districts where the need therefor still exists.

It is the belief, I am sure, of the education committee, at least, and it is the impression of the Committee on Rules, that the total expenditure will not reach \$5,000,000 during the next year, but it is necessary to take this action and extend this law or authority, in this reduced manner, in order to take care of those school districts which still remain uncared for because of the emergency created by the present housing shortage.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman from Ohio that in my district we have two or three places where exactly the situation that the gentleman describes obtains, and those schools could not possibly operate unless they get some help. That is a condition which has resulted from the war effort in the metropolitan area of Detroit. There is no other way of solving it than the passage of this type of legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am hoping that these Government-owned housing facilities will be sold, if they are of permanent construction, and go back on the tax rolls soon.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I just wanted to say that I congratulate the gentleman's committee that brought this piece of legislation up. It is greatly needed, and in some instances the need is even greater than it ever has been at the peak of Federal employees in those districts. Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; in some instances families have moved in where only military and naval personnel were located before, which has actually brought about a greater problem. This seems to be a rather noncontroversial measure. We have a heavy schedule today, and I do not care to take further time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. On the question of non-controversiality, it was a divided report from the Committee on Education and Labor, and a minority report was filed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I think there was a very minor minority report filed, if I remember.

Mr. BUCK. There were six persons who signed the minority reports.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand such to be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it comes mighty hard to me to call attention frequently to rules that are being brought to this House making in order legislation which calls for more and more of the taxpayers' money. Unfortunately, many of my friends have some of these schools in their districts, and they, I know, are in favor of this bill, which will cost somewhere between five and seven million dollars to take care of the schools in the districts where the War Department erected plants and factories away from districts and sections of our country where we had plenty of schools and facilities.

GHOST TOWNS

You older Members will remember that for 4 or 5 years I objected to the War and Navy Departments' real estate experts recommending purchase of sites miles away from populated sections where there was available a plentiful supply of labor, manufacturing facilities, schools, and housing recommendations. I pointed out that the experts who were recommending these sites were disregarding the tremendous cost that was entailed to the Government in the future, because they required the construction not only of many buildings and homes for the workers but also of schools, streets, sewers, places of entertainment and many other facilities.

I stated that as soon as the war was over these cities that had been built up surrounding and adjoining the plants would naturally become ghost towns and after the war it would be necessary to dismantle them at great loss to the Government. I realize that due to the shortage of housing many former war workers are still retaining their homes around these plants, despite the fact that they are obliged to travel from 20 to 50 miles to work in their new employment, these plants being closed. I call attention to that fact because I feel that the committee did not receive the information it was entitled to.

LOW-COST LAND

The localities and the school districts have not lost a great deal of tax income, as the gentleman from Ohio stated, due to the Government taking over some of the land and the school districts being deprived of their tax money, because most of the land that was acquired by the Government was extremely low-cost or cheap land and the taxes on such vacant property did not amount to very much. On the other hand, the moment the Government started to construct towns around the section, the workers that moved in and were receiving good pay started to spend their money in that locality, and those districts and the mushroom towns that were built actually benefited the local governments. They have not lost anything whatever, because the tax benefits they derived out of the thousands of people that moved in were far greater than the few dollars the

county, the township, or the school district was deprived of in taxes because of the Government taking over the property.

I call attention to the fact that two of the Members stated in the minority views filed with the committee report:

We voted against reporting out H. R. 3682 because of the lack of adequate information about, and specifications of, projects for which school funds should be provided.

HOUSE NEEDS MORE FACTS

The minority report is signed by Mr. McCONNELL and by Mr. KENNEDY. I have not been and am not a member of that committee and I did not have the hearings. All I ever am able to obtain are the few words when the Members appear or the chairman of the committee appears before the Committee on Rules and in a few brief remarks say, "Well, the committee reported this out, and we ought to have a rule."

While I was chairman of the Committee on Rules I always endeavored to obtain some information that would justify the granting of a rule, so that I could be able to say after a legislative committee reported a bill out that I thought it should receive clearance and that the House was entitled to pass upon it. But at the same time the House is entitled to some facts. I know in these last few days of the session there is a great rush of the Members to get home, and I do not blame them. I am going to join them as soon as I can get through here; but we should not be too hasty in reporting out and passing resolutions to investigate this, that, and the other thing, and appropriate money which, of course, adds to the burden of our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois knows that I have the highest regard for him, and I feel certain that he would not want to take his seat and leave any misinformation with us intentionally. With regard to the length of the hearings, may I make this observation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I have yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. COMBS. This question has been studied and hearings have been held on it since early in the year by the Committee on Education and Labor. They held extensive hearings. With regard to the scattering of these industries over the Nation, if that had not been done, if all manufacturing and things of that kind, the building of airplanes and tanks and everything else and ships, had been concentrated in our heavily populated centers, they would have been more overloaded, and schools and transportation facilities would have been overtaxed and we would not have been able to get the job done. What actually happened was that every place in the Nation had its factories and its installations and altogether we did a job that amazed the world. Without that, we could not have done it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate that, but I stated then, and I repeat now, that it was not necessary to go 25 and 30 and 50 miles from nowhere where you had to build access

roads from the main highways, streets, sewers, schools, churches, and places of amusement, saying nothing as to the homes that had to be built for the war workers running into costs of millions of dollars. That is one reason there is such a shortage of homes now—tens of thousands of homes had to be built for the war workers. I was interested in saving money for the Government and making it easier for the worker so that they would not be obliged to travel a long distance to go to work.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I, too, always had great esteem for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Again, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that you are citing isolated instances. You are citing facts that do not exist, and you are leaving an impression on the floor of the House that a man of your standing should certainly retract.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman has any real information and will be honest, he would not dare to make that statement.

Mr. RIVERS. I have it right here and I am going to make a speech on it.

Mr. SABATH. I know about the conditions and I called attention to them for 4 or 5 years. If the gentleman had been in the House when I frequently called attention to the mistakes that the War Department was making in following the advice of these so-called real-estate experts on designating available localities, and what additional unnecessary expense such localities would entail, he would not ask that I retract my statement, but he would be obliged to confirm every statement that I have made.

I suppose the gentleman has one or two of these schools in his district. I have none. I am interested in school children and I want them to have an education. But I call attention to the unnecessary expenditures, at times reckless expenditures. However, that is water over the dam. Still I have a right to call attention to it. I should dislike very much to deprive any of the gentlemen who have some of these plants in their districts, and who need additional funds to maintain the schools, but I feel they could easily do without this aid of five or six million dollars in view of the revenue that the towns and townships derived from the spending of millions of dollars by the millions of war workers in these school districts.

I felt it my duty to call attention to these things. I assure the gentleman I know a great deal about it. If he will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he will be satisfied that I do know, and that I have repeatedly called attention to departmental extravagances, notwithstanding the fact that it was being done under a Democratic administration, but by a War Department that is always extremely reckless with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1947, the Secretary of the Treasury addressed a communication to the Speaker of the House requesting the introduction of a bill "for the more economical operation of the general-supplies fund of the Bureau of Federal Supplies, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes." A copy of the proposed bill was enclosed.

This communication was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. We now find it should have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of this communication and that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3682, known as the Landis bill, is of supreme importance to the State of Georgia. In several sections of the State, notably at Brunswick, at Columbus in Muscogee County, and Marietta in Cobb County, the location of the huge Bell bomber plant which turned out great quantities of B-29's, there was an influx of workers with their families. Great housing projects were built for the war-time workers. This put a terrible strain upon the school facilities of these and other counties in the State. The Congress recognized its responsibility in helping the local school communities to meet their problem and enacted what has come to be known as the Lanham Act. But for the help given under the Lanham Act, the schools in many of our counties in Georgia would have broken down almost entirely. The problem was simply more than the State and local communities could meet unaided.

I am more familiar with the situation at Marietta, in Cobb County, than with the situation at Brunswick and Columbus, because Cobb County is located in the Seventh District, which I represent. The situation in this county was made much more acute by the fact that the Government owns quite a large amount of real estate in the county. For instance, there is Kennesaw National Park, which has taken from the tax rolls of the county 2,882 acres of the valuation of \$72,050. The Bell bomber plant took from the tax rolls 2,350 acres at a valuation of \$58,750. The Allatoona Dam has taken from the county's tax rolls 3,950 acres of a total value of \$98,750. There is an Army air base located in the county which has taken 603 acres from the tax rolls of a total value of \$15,075. This makes a total of 9,785 acres owned by the Government in the county of a total value of \$144,625. All of this has been taken

from the tax assessment rolls of the county.

This situation in Cobb County illustrates also the tremendous increase in enrollment of pupils in the county schools. In the school year 1942-43, the total enrollment was 5,290 in the schools of the county. In 1946-47, the total enrollment was 6,844, and an expected enrollment for the school year 1947-48 is 7,169.

The reason for the continued enrollment since the plant is no longer in operation is due to the fact that because of the housing shortage, all of the housing built for the workers in the Bell bomber plant is still occupied by people who work in Atlanta and other nearby cities. The children are still living in the county and must be taken care of by the local schools.

To show that the local community and the State have done everything possible to meet the situation, I need only recite the figures. For the school year 1943-44, the local tax rate was 5 mills. This raised a total of \$49,280.50. The State's contribution for the same period was \$184,840.02. During that year the Federal Works Agency contributed Lanham funds in the total amount of \$18,028.78, and there was miscellaneous income of \$6,528, making a total of \$258,677.30. In the school year 1946-47 the amount raised by a local tax of 15 mills was \$143,000. For the same period the State contributed \$341,973. Lanham fund contributions were \$80,027, which, with \$10,000 miscellaneous income made the total expenditures for the year \$575,000.

It is readily seen from the above that the Cobb County school system is overburdened with a war-incurred enrollment of approximately 2,000 more students than during its last normal year. The local government has gone its limit in trying to meet this responsibility, having increased the rate of taxation from 5 to 15 mills, as stated above, along with an increase in property valuations. It is to be noticed that the State has almost doubled its contribution. If this bill is not passed and Federal aid extended for one more year, the county will simply have to cut its school term from 9 to 7 or possibly 5 or 6 months. This situation is definitely caused by the war and its aftermath and is, therefore, a Federal responsibility.

A somewhat similar, though not quite so severe, situation exists in Polk County, Ga., of which Cedartown is the county seat. Here are located many textile plants which were in operation at full speed making textiles for clothing and tire fabric as its contribution to the war effort. Before the war the Polk County schools had an enrollment of approximately 3,500. For the current school year, that is, the 1946-47 school year, the average daily attendance was 4,202.

The county and State have made a tremendous effort to meet this influx of children into the schools caused by the war effort. For the school year 1941-42 the State contributed to the county \$95,718 while the county and districts contributed \$37,765. In the school year 1946-47, the State aid had been raised more than double and amounted to \$245,000 and the county and school

districts had practically doubled their contribution making a total as their contribution for that year of \$72,600. Even with the assistance of the Federal Government through Lanham funds, the county has not been able to maintain its schools at a normal level. In 1941 all of its teachers had at least 2 years of college preparation. In the school year just closed the system had 45 teachers of a total of 170 who had less than 1 year of college work. Unless this bill, the Landis bill, is passed, which in effect extends Lanham fund aid, the Polk County Board of Education will have to cut off 28 school teachers and crowd the children into fewer classrooms or reduce the length of the term to 6 or 7 months instead of the present 9-month school term. Moreover, the schools will have to be operated without janitors and janitor supplies.

The same sort of condition exists in Floyd County in which is located the city of Rome. The entire county is largely industrial and contributed the products of its factories and foundries to the war effort. I will not quote statistics for this county but substantially the same state of affairs exists in Floyd County as in the other two counties in the district to which I have already referred.

I plead with you to pass this bill so that these children who are not to blame for the situation may not be denied the benefit of an education.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if you will read the minority report accompanying this bill, you will find that a year ago the communities which were receiving assistance were told that was the last year they would receive assistance, and they all agreed they would get out from under this load and take care of these communities themselves—the local communities in the States.

I tell you there are a lot of dilatory tactics being practiced in the various locations where these communities exist. It seems to me, if we are going to give \$5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for inefficiency back in the States, it is about time we called a halt to it and tell these communities to tend to their own knitting. They are not expected to come in here and ask us for \$5,000,000 to pay for the inefficiency of the local people.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we were also told that a housing authority was going to dispose of these properties. That has not been done. Therefore, the revenues derived from taxation on these properties is not being received by the communities.

Mr. RICH. The quicker they sell these properties to the local communities the better off the people of this country are going to be.

Mr. BARDEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. It is past time that the Government got out of business. We have been having too much of the Government getting into all kinds of busi-

ness. It just makes me sick because we have so much inefficiency in our Government. The employees are inactive. They do not do the things they should. If anyone should get out and stir these people up, it is the Congress. The only way we can stir them up is to stop these appropriations. Then they will act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I ask the gentleman to yield to point out the fact that this bill returns \$5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money which has been paid into the Federal Treasury, returns it to the school districts, so that the taxpayers get the benefit of it, including several areas in the gentleman's own State.

Mr. RICH. I want the people in my district to get on their toes and get busy. I do not want any more fooling around. I want to stop these appropriations for inefficiency back in the States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly supporting this resolution and hope that it will be passed, and I am also supporting the bill which it makes in order for consideration. I know it will be contended by some that this work should be ended, now that the war is over, and communities should take care of their own school problems in their own way. It is not so simple as that, nor can we, by wishing, return at once to the prewar conditions. The war did complicate the domestic school problem greatly and to such an extent that it will take some time to work out a solution.

I have heard some gentlemen complain about war installations, feeling that war plants were often built not near their large cities but in remote rural communities where housing and school facilities had to be improvised throughout. I distinctly remember that during the period of preparation that the majority of Members were seeking one kind of military installation or another and hoping to get war plants located within their districts, not only from the patriotic motive of wishing to help in the war effort but also hoping, no doubt, that such wartime installations might prove an economic aid to their communities. Since the war I have heard some of my colleagues declare that they now wish there had been no such military or defense establishments located within their district. The aftermath and the headaches caused by the dislocations are extremely painful and difficult of solution.

One reason why I favor the bill which we shall take up on the adoption of this rule is that I know personally of several communities in Arizona adjacent to war plants which are struggling with their overcrowded school conditions and carrying an almost unbearable burden of debt and financial obligation. I am fairly well acquainted with the schools and the school authorities in Arizona. I have received numerous communications from school superintendents and school boards, urging that something be done under the former Lanham Act plan to assist them. Let me take a case or two for example.

Before the recent war, the Isaac School District, lying in a rich agricultural community west of the city of Phoenix but not far from it, was a typical high-class consolidated rural school. I have known J. B. Sutton, the superintendent, for a long time, and I know that he had few worries of a professional or financial nature concerning his school prior to the outbreak of the war. Then what happened? A big war plant was established in his community. Thousands of war workers flocked to this plant. Hastily constructed housing was furnished, and the enrollment of Isaac School expanded enormously. And now that the war is over, what is the situation? Many of those families are still residing in property that pays no local taxes. The district is bonded and taxed to the limit, and since—in the case of this school as in the case of other Arizona school districts—a large share of the financial support is derived from a local ad valorem tax. This community cannot raise enough by local taxation to pay for the cost of the schooling of the children who have been there, many of them, for 4 or 5 years, and are still enrolled.

I can cite other cases similar to the Isaac School District, not only on the outskirts of Phoenix but also on the outskirts of Tucson, and still other districts more remote from good-sized cities. The presence of these children in those school districts is a result of the war. The cost of taking care of their education is as much an obligation of the Federal Government as are most of the other continuing expenses occasioned by the war. This legislation may be but a stop-gap and temporary, but it is to be hoped that it will be enacted for immediate need and followed by a more permanent program such as may be required.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3682, with Mr. LEONARD W. HALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to continue Federal assistance to those schools that are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments and which are unable through local revenue and from State contributions to provide schooling for this increased enrollment.

The amount will not exceed the sum of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948. The program cost four-

teen million in 1945-46 and seven million in 1946-47.

This is not a bill for foreign aid but for American school children. It provides Federal assistance for a pressing problem that has arisen out of the war and its aftermath. During the war period thousands of war workers and their families migrated into war areas, greatly increasing school attendance and imposing severe financial burdens on local school systems. During the war the Government recognized its responsibilities to these communities and granted assistance under the Lanham Act.

Without such assistance many of these schools will have to close down or cut their school term to 4 to 6 months. The State aid pays only a part of the total costs of maintenance and operations of schools. The local school agencies have made a strenuous effort to meet this problem by increasing substantially the amount of local funds for school purposes. This increase in State and local revenues, however, has not been sufficient to meet the double burden of this increased enrollment and the loss of tax revenues.

The Federal Government has acquired and now owns considerable land in numerous communities. This land has been removed from the local tax rolls. Last year 76 schools received assistance because of the problem of tax-exempt federally owned property. Another 26 communities were provided school services for residents of nontaxable Army- or Navy-owned reservations and 65 areas faced the problem of Federal-owned war housing.

Defense housing continues to be occupied at capacity levels. The problem is intensified by the shortage of housing and the increased need for veteran housing.

The early enactment of this bill is urgent. The local school districts must hire their teachers for the 1947-48 school year.

It is true the Federal Public Housing Authority has failed to dispose of the houses, stores, and other property. Why, I do not know. According to an act of Congress they must dispose of them by December 31, 1948. I hope it will be possible to dispose of this property by June 30, 1948. The Public Housing Administration has collected \$274,760,000, but only a net income from rents of \$111,130,000.

It is true the Federal Works Commissioner testified last year they would be able to close out the program in one more year. I also believe Mr. Fields wants to be relieved of this emergency problem. But the problem is still with us, the Government still owns this property, and the States are not able to furnish enough State aid to handle the situation.

The minority report says the evidence presented covers less than a dozen communities. But according to evidence which I have from the Federal Works Administration, 132 schools from 35 States have requested financial aid. It will take approximately \$5,000,000 to take care of this program.

Congress has made arrangements to give and loan \$20,000,000,000 to foreign countries and much more will be de-

manded to take care of the children and people in these foreign lands.

I am surprised and disappointed to learn that some people who favor these gigantic gift-loans to foreign nations oppose this \$5,000,000 bill to help educate our own American children.

I believe it is about time to make some cuts in these foreign gifts and make some provisions for Americans in the way of better pensions for our elders and better minimum wages for our underpaid workers.

I would like to make this observation, that in these 193 schools there was an increase of 127,000 pupils in average daily attendance.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I want to commend my colleague from Indiana for the foresight and initiative that prompts him to bring this measure before the House. I have within one of the counties in the district I represent an ordinance plant of several thousand acres that was taken off the local tax rolls, bringing with it that great influx of residents and overcrowded population in our schools, and we realize very much the need for this continued help, and I am glad to support the measure.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Do I understand correctly that this bill does not affect communities like, for instance, Wrightstown, in my own district, near Fort Dix, which is a permanent installation and which has been increased during the war? It does not affect that, does it?

Mr. LANDIS. Unless it is on the list. The gentleman can check the list and see if it is on it.

Mr. MATHEWS. The list is not in the report.

Mr. LANDIS. They are not all listed in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I would like to make one more point. The national average cost last year per pupil was \$135. In these areas, the average is \$90, and all this bill does is add \$14 per pupil in these 132 school districts. There have been 132 requests in 35 States, which will amount to \$5,000,000. Of course, the chief objection to this bill was that last year the Federal Works people said that it was only going to last last year, and that would conclude it. But, we cannot help it because the Federal Works Administration made a mistake, and that these houses are still there. Some of the civilians have moved out of these houses and veterans have taken their places. In these houses today over half of the people are veterans and their families, and over half of the total are veterans' children. There are 367,000 children in these housing areas that must be taken care of. They will either have to close the schools or limit the school term to from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURKE. I should like to add my support to this measure. In my district, Wright Field and Patterson Field have been encroaching upon the taxable areas and have reduced the amount of the school district income.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The local and State funds in these supported school districts have increased more than \$15,000,000 this year.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it was with reluctance that I voted in favor of reporting this legislation to the House because I am personally in favor of the Government getting out of this war-incurred educational program as quickly as possible. I can assure the Members of this House that I gave much thought to every provision of this bill and would not have voted in favor of reporting it out of our committee had not the present committee amendments been adopted.

This bill, as amended, extends the period of time to June 30, 1948, for providing emergency educational assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments and limits the amount authorized to be appropriated to \$5,000,000. It makes available Federal assistance for immediate needs arising out of the war emergency and provides for contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance provided they received assistance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, which was the termination date under the provisions of the Lanham Act that Federal assistance could be given to schools coming within the classification provided by this legislation.

During the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on H. R. 3682 and bills of similar character testimony was presented to the committee that indicated that unless Federal aid was continued in certain school districts, the schools would not be able to operate more than 4 to 6 months from their own funds and that it would be impossible with the present teacher shortage to induce competent teachers to accept positions in these school districts.

During the war period it was necessary under our all-out war program to establish plants, shipyards, and Army and Navy installations all over our country and in a great many instances there were no houses available for the immigrant workers who were employed at these installations. Under title I of the Lanham Act temporary housing to meet the needs of these in-migrant workers and their families was authorized and under title II of the act community facilities that were necessary to carry on the community life of these various housing centers were established.

The Lanham Act also provided that this housing should be disposed of within 2 years after the termination of the war. However, due to the housing and

material shortage, as well as the difficulty of finding homes for our returning veterans, it has not been possible to dispose of these temporary-housing projects. In fact, testimony was presented to our committee that the occupants of some of these projects were more than 50 percent veterans. There are many reasons why these projects should be sold or turned over to local authorities immediately, but as that is not the subject under consideration, I will not take up the time of the House to discuss that phase of the housing program.

However, there is another phase of the housing program that I wish to discuss briefly, and that directly concerns the war-incurred educational program. The Federal Public Housing Authority is obligated under law to turn back to the local authorities payments in lieu of taxes sums equivalent to those that would have been received had the property been privately owned.

The real difficulty is that the Housing Authority is collecting the rents from these housing projects and bringing them back to Washington to make a good showing for the Federal Public Housing Authority. The sums they pay to the local governments in lieu of taxes are not sufficient to meet the expenses incident for the normal operations of the schools, fire department, police department, and other community facilities as provided by title II of the Lanham Act.

In brief, the Federal Public Housing Authority, in order to make a good showing for themselves in Washington, are in reality robbing the local authorities of the funds necessary to educate the children in the communities this bill is designed to assist. It is because of these conditions that I was reluctant to support this legislation.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman has made a very correct statement. Does he believe we should permit that situation to continue?

Mr. LESINSKI. It is up to the Congress to correct. Personally, I cannot do it myself, but I am bringing it to the attention of the Congress.

It is for that reason that I deem it desirable to pass this emergency stop-gap legislation with its limitations of time and money until Congress in its wisdom remedies that phase of the housing program.

Mr. Chairman, I was convinced by the testimony presented to our committee that there are school districts in the United States that require emergency educational aid. I was also convinced after a careful study of all the facts that the Federal Public Housing Authority in many instances was not giving the local governments a square deal in the sums they are paying in lieu of taxes. However, the most important factor to consider at this time is that the first of September—the beginning of the school year—is almost at hand. That, coupled with the fact that this session of Con-

gress will shortly adjourn—in my humble opinion—is the reason why this legislation should be enacted into law in order that children residing in school districts, burdened with war-incurred enrollments, will be assured of a full term education beginning this fall.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buck].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I was perfectly astonished to hear the eminent gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] stand in the well of the House a few minutes ago and say that this bill is noncontroversial. His memory is surprisingly short.

The bill came out of the Committee on Education and Labor on a divided vote. A number of members of the committee signed a minority report and then some of us appeared before the Committee on Rules. In the Committee on Rules the first action, according to my information, was that the rule be denied. Then, on subsequent consideration, the rule was granted. That is hardly the history of a noncontroversial piece of legislation.

Everyone who has had to do with education not only admits that education is a State function but will fight to the last ditch to assure that education does remain a State function. If it is admitted that education is a State responsibility, why was it that the States, on notice a year ago that this Federal aid would terminate, sit back and do absolutely nothing? The States had 1 year's notice that they would get no more of this Federal aid. Yet here it is almost the 1st of August, and we are told that unless the Federal Government passes this legislation many children in the States will have no education. The States lie back and attempt to shift their responsibility to the Federal Government, probably because they think the Federal Government is easy, and I am beginning to agree with that interpretation.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero] hit the nail on the head a few moments ago when he said that unless the Federal Government passes this bill there is no other source of money for this education. In other words, he is telling us that this will not be the last year but that it will go on and on and on until we get our backs up and let the States take the responsibility which is theirs.

Let us examine for a minute the housing situation. There are two types of housing which are involved in this Federal aid.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from New York as a member of the committee which formerly handled Lanham Act funds. If my memory serves me correctly, this is about the third time that this group has come before the committee and asked for an extension or a continuation of these funds with relation to this program. I definitely feel that the time has come, perhaps not this year, but most assuredly next year, when the Congress should stop this kind of program.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. This seems to me to be the most outrageous kind of pork-barrel legislation that I have ever seen. Everybody is trying to get their hands into the grab bag. I think it is high time to put a stop to it. Personally, I am disgusted with this type of legislation and I am going to continue to vote against it.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

I want to turn briefly to the types of housing which furnish the excuse for this legislation. There are two kinds of housing for which it is claimed that the Federal Government has responsibility. One is the permanent Army and Navy installation. Can anyone conceive of the Government attempting to take away a navy yard or an Army post and not have the chamber of commerce, the mayor of the city, and all the first citizens come down here with tears in their eyes to ask us to save that facility for their community? Yet, having that benefit, they now come here and ask the Federal Government to help educate the children that accompany that installation.

The second type affected is temporary housing. I say to you that any community which has this temporary housing with which to provide homes for its returning veterans and for others during the housing shortage is indeed blessed. I wish I had five or ten thousand more temporary houses in my own community, and then possibly we could accommodate veterans who need housing so badly. Yet that is given as an excuse. The very communities that have the advantage of this surplus housing, into which veterans and their families can move, are the ones who are coming here and asking nutriment from the Federal nipple in order to educate the children who live in those houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buck] has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. BUCK. The time has come to decide whether this sort of Federal aid to education is to end or is to go on indefinitely. As has been pointed out, we have three times said it was the end. If this bill is enacted the States will never take over the responsibility which is genuinely theirs. The bill should be defeated, and at the proper time I will offer a motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buck] has again expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Pace].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I have complete confidence in the sense of fairness of the Members of the House, and if the Members understand this problem I do not believe there will be a single vote against this bill.

There are two of these projects in the district I serve. I would like to refer to them. Our Government went out into a cotton field and constructed one of its great air depots. There are only eleven

in the Nation. They constructed the depot and a majority of the homes for 30,000 employees. It is there today in operation. It is in a small country county. The small amount the Government pays in lieu of taxes is inconsequential, compared with the need of teachers for educating the children who came there from nearly every State in this Union. There is a State responsibility, I think, referred to by the gentleman from New York. My State is trying, as best it can, to fulfill its part, but it does seem to me that under these circumstances, where the State contributes only a part of the cost of education in our respective States, where there is a small country county that has no possibility of realizing revenue adequate to educate these children, as long as that establishment is operating, as long as those hundreds and hundreds of children are there, it should not only be the pleasure but it should be the duty of the Federal Government to contribute toward their education.

We have a similar situation in Muscogee County, Ga., in which is located our greatest military establishment, Fort Benning. You are all familiar with the enormous expansion at Fort Benning during the war. At times there were nearly a hundred thousand troops in training there. This naturally required great increases in civilian personnel. It also required an expansion of the reservation, to a total of 45,000 acres, of which 20,000 acres were formerly a part of Muscogee County and is now tax-exempt.

To meet this situation the Government constructed an enormous housing project, known as Baker Village. It also constructed school buildings. There are 1,142 housing units in the village with 900 children attending school. At \$72 for each pupil it is costing the State and county \$64,800 to operate this school, but the amount paid in lieu of taxes is only \$16,000. The county is now levying a tax of 12 mills but it is not adequate to provide the teachers to instruct these children.

And in addition to that the Federal Works Agency is now demanding that the county purchase the high school building. It has no funds for that purpose.

The end of the war has not reduced this problem. In the county the school enrollment in 1942 was 3,982, during the 1945-46 term the enrollment was 7,695, and during the 1946-47 term the enrollment increased to 7,949.

Certainly the Federal Government has a direct and inescapable obligation to Muscogee County to contribute toward the cost of educating these children. I am confident your sense of fairness will prompt you to authorize and require the Government to do so through the passage of this bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gwinn].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a case where the people have the capacity to pay for the education of their own children, those are the special housing projects given to the people at low rent, with everybody in those places, like the one just described by the gentleman from Georgia,

well employed at high wages, around airports, and in air construction and in the industrial centers; full employment, with high wages, and yet the alleged incapacity to pay the tuition cost of educating their own children.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Does the gentleman realize that regardless of the high wages the floating population of those communities received, that the taxes paid to meet the expenses of educating their children must come from the land and the ad valorem taxes levied on it?

Mr. GWINN of New York. That is not quite true as I understand the situation. The fact is that the wealth is there. The States have had 2 years within which to adjust their own machinery to collect the necessary funds from the people who have the money. The local assessor could assess the taxes necessary because under the law the Federal Housing Authority that still owns these properties must turn back to the local school districts enough money to take care of these children.

All that the local tax assessor has to do is to assess these properties, the real estate, the houses, the stores, the gas stations, to raise enough money so that the Housing Authority, which is really the deficient Federal arm here at fault, will have to pay these funds back to the communities to educate these children.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Is there any testimony to support this amount of \$5,000,000?

Mr. GWINN of New York. There is no testimony to support any special sum, any special amount. The only people who appeared before this committee added up their claims to a little over a million, and yet this committee is inviting the communities as a whole not to pay for their own education but to come to Washington and ask for \$5,000,000. In effect this bill says: "Here it is, take it away."

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. COMBS. I know the gentleman does not want to leave any misinformation concerning the right to tax. The gentleman knows, if he will stop and think, that these Federal housing projects cannot be taxed one dime. What the Congress has done is to authorize payment to the local communities by the Federal Government of what taxes would be levied on these little temporary shacks were they privately owned.

Mr. GWINN of New York. In order to arrive at the amount the assessor under the law is required to indicate what the amount of the assessment would be. Then the Federal Housing Authority takes a part of the rents collected from these people and turns it back to the school district. There it is, there is the money, there are the people with the money, if they will only collect it and apply it. The States have built these houses, given them to the people. The

property is there. The value is assessable; yet people in New York and other States are asked to continue to educate the children. They have plenty of property with which they could educate their own children. This amounts to a double gift that the people of this country are asked to send to these communities.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York would not want to leave the impression with the Congress that the local communities have not raised their own taxes. They have been raised in the case of these properties to the extent of \$15,000,000. The Congress is asked to assume a little less than 30 percent of the load to help in this education problem.

Mr. GWINN of New York. The fact is that these particular communities are not making their contribution, but should.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, there has been ample testimony and ample evidence given to the great Committee on Education and Labor and the Rules Committee justifying the passage of this legislation. If you can picture the brass hats who built a lot of these housing projects going into a community and taking everything they could take, building these projects, and under the law being required to give back to the school districts a certain amount of money which they did not do, and their rights under the law should be equal, and assessing these districts as though they were cornfields and not a housing project, leaving them absolutely helpless, you get an accurate picture of the conditions that the gentlemen from Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas have told you about.

We have one community in our district of 40,000 war workers. They built housing projects so large you get lost in them. They have not turned them back. I agree with the gentleman from New York, in discussing this matter, they should have been turned back, but they have not been turned back and until they are turned back we are absolutely without help to run these districts. In one little county in my district I know of they have raised the school levy 23 mills, which is taking all the property from the people practically. I will tell you something else they have done about some of these housing projects. The gentleman from New York told you that the war workers get these fabulous salaries and are given low rents. That does not exist in my part of the country. In every housing project in my district they have raised the rent, yet they are not giving the money to the school districts in accordance with the law.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. As long as the Government collects the rents and controls the

houses it ought to pay the school district?

Mr. RIVERS. Why, that is an obvious obligation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Just to clarify and emphasize the situation, is it not a fact that whatever rent is collected on these housing projects goes into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. RIVERS. Of course it does and if they were honest about this thing we would not have to pass this legislation. We have sent the money to Washington and I do not think it is remiss of us to ask you to send it back to us.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman does not wish to create the impression that these projects are self-sustaining?

Mr. RIVERS. No. I mean to say, though, that if these housing projects were run right and the schools got their proportionate part, we would not be coming in here asking for this legislation. The gentleman from Michigan told us in a very masterly way they are trying to make a racket for themselves in Washington instead of meeting their direct obligation.

Mr. MACKINNON. The gentleman has put his finger right on the problem.

Mr. RIVERS. Whenever you want to take them back, I am with you.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does the gentleman know that in many instances these housing projects are on federally owned land, part of which is a military reservation that has been taken off the general tax rolls within the school district, yet the children are brought there and it puts an added burden on the school district?

Mr. RIVERS. I know of one housing project in one of my very congested areas down there of over 400 units owned by the Navy and they do not put 5 cents back into the district. We owe this obligation and I hope we will dispense it here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate there are so many missing in the Committee of the Whole when an important argument is in progress; however, we hope that those who are present will have a message to deliver to those who are now absent when they are ready to vote on the issue.

I feel that the most important thing in our life in America has been local autonomy, the strength of the local municipalities in America. Therein lies the reason we in America have been able to rise to meet each emergency, even to the

extent of coming from a peace-loving nation and going through two wars, being able to equip ourselves in time to meet the challenge of those who would attempt to rule the world.

Now, next to the municipality, of course, is the State, and as a municipality has strength and as a group of municipalities have strength, so the States have strength. It is just like the character of an individual. If the individuals of a municipality have character, then the municipality has character and the States—in which such municipalities are located—have character. What have we been doing by paying out these moneys through the years? Only weakening that character and weakening the backbone of the Nation. I have given consideration to this matter in committee, and it is a thing to which I directed my main attention and my questions.

Now, let us analyze these projects. During the war there were people occupying those houses who had swollen incomes each week. They were paying money to the Federal Public Housing Authority for rent and they were spending the balance of their money throughout those towns and villages which were close by.

No arrangement appears to have been made for a sales tax or the taking of any other steps which would provide a fund for these schools, nor has the Federal Public Housing Authority, which has taken that money, made proper arrangements to give it back to the communities as they should, as has been pointed out by the preceding speaker. Does that mean that we in Congress are going to continue to dip into the Treasury of the United States, not only to pay those funds but, as I said before, to weaken the strength of the people? I agree, as I said, that if they were told that they could not continue this housing project any longer, so that those people would not have the money to spend in those villages, they would object to the closing. But, they say, "No; we want to keep them there." However, they are not willing to make any plans in regard to paying their way. They say, "The Army wants us to remain there." Well, if the Army wants them to remain there, then the Army should foot the bill; that would take care of that proposition. If the Federal Public Housing Authority is to continue for the next year, they should foot the bill.

Right now we are preparing to make an investigation throughout America with respect to racketeering in housing. I am beginning to believe that it does not concern business and labor only but even concerns our public offices and public officers, and one of the first investigations that should be made is right in the Federal Public Housing Authority to see why they have been taking that money and building up that agency to the detriment of those people in those communities. Insofar as I am concerned, I believe the real thing for us to do here is to cast a vote which shows that we are not in favor of having this continued. Naturally, none of us feels, when we have the facts set before us now, when they are asking for help for another year on the theory that it is going to end at that

point, that we want to hurt them and have it end right now, if it is really going to hurt them in that way, but I believe the only way we can show our purpose is to cast a vote against this type of legislation right now in order to give the people of America the thought that they should rely upon themselves, and not constantly be coming to the Federal Government for aid. What it does is to encourage the citizens of States which have low incomes to oppose all Federal income-tax reductions in order that money might be available to pay the subsidies which are being handed out for every conceivable purpose. Continuance of Federal aid to certain localities of the country is not fair to the other sections thereof which do not receive such aid. Let us be just before we are too generous.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the consideration of this bill no one will confuse the problem before us this morning with the general question of Federal aid to education. The two have nothing in common and are entirely separate. This is a simple problem of carrying out commitments which were made during the war period. What do I mean by that? I mean simply that the Federal Government brought these people from all parts of the country into communities, in many instances small communities, it gathered them there to perform a specific wartime act. This resulted in overtaxing the school and other facilities of these communities. Unfortunately, when the guns ceased firing on the front these people did not leave these communities. They are still there in most instances.

I think I could best illustrate this by citing the case of my own home town of Pascagoula, Miss. I live in what was a community of 6,000 people in the pre-war days. The Federal Government came in there and built sufficient housing to take care of a population which suddenly was accelerated to 40,000. This was necessitated by the construction of ships. Those people are still there.

What are you going to do about it? My friends on the other side who oppose this say, "Let the communities, let the local governments take care of it." Over 70 percent of the children who attend the public schools in my home town come from this housing project. If my community, which has already taxed itself to the limitation of the law, got the permission of the State legislature to increase its taxation 1,000 percent, that still would not meet the situation. We have already taxed ourselves to the statutory limit but we cannot meet that situation.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield in my brief time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Under the citation that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] mentioned, the Housing Authority must turn back whatever money the assessor says is necessary to meet the taxes on these very houses.

Mr. COLMER. I am glad I yielded to the gentleman for I want to answer that question. Provision was made under the Lanham Act, and if the gentleman will pardon a self-serving declaration, it was put in there at my suggestion to try to help that situation. But the trouble is that the amount allowed is insufficient to anything like meet the situation.

This is a real problem and one that must be met if these children are to receive education. Moreover, I repeat that this is a war incurred obligation of the Federal Government. I believe that this Congress believes in fair play. I have confidence that this body will go along with those of us who are sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to question the accuracy of the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], which I am sure he made quite inadvertently. But the fact is that a list of the communities affected by H. R. 3682 is not included in the report on the bill.

However, since asking the question which gave rise to this statement, I have been shown a mimeographed list and find that there are included communities in or near which there are permanent establishments of the Army or Navy.

I am opposed to the constant attempts to gradually socialize this Nation through Federal grants-in-aid, loans with Federal bossism attached, increasing Federal jurisdiction over States, municipalities, and the people thereof, whether these things be under the guise of education, lunches for children, or similar appealing designations.

But this bill deals with a totally different situation. It deals with a condition created by the Federal Government in carrying on a war and, therefore, it is a matter of justice that the Federal Government should not leave the municipalities affected in the position of alone bearing the burden of that condition.

There has been advanced as an argument against this bill, the fact that the executive branch of the Federal Government has not complied with the intent and meaning of acts passed by this Congress with reference to the disposal of certain structures erected under the Lanham Act, the theory apparently being that since the executive branch of the Federal Government had not done what it should do, the result of this negligence should be borne by the municipalities. I can find neither reason nor logic in such a contention.

And certainly a condition like this could have no bearing on a situation in which a permanent establishment of the armed services had grown quite large as the result of the war and its aftermath of increased defense forces. The problem of the education of the children of people living upon or near such reservations which is forced upon the nearby communities is one which the Federal Government, in all fairness and justice, must help that community solve for a little while until some permanent solution is worked out.

In the State of New Jersey we have no income tax, sales tax, or similar method whereby money which this added population might spend in the communities can be taken. The bulk of taxes for school purposes raised by the communities is from real-estate taxes, and real property, whether owned by the Federal Government or otherwise, which is exempt from taxation, naturally, does not furnish any financial assistance. Usually, too, in such communities, there is additional expense for increased police and, sometimes fire protection, which must be borne by the municipality.

For these reasons and because the bill now before us is designed only to assist municipal authorities which are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments, I shall vote for the bill. In the name of plain and simple justice, this bill should be passed.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, whatever is the cause of the unhappy situation in reference to housing and the various postwar problems of the country, certainly they are not the responsibility of a few communities. There was placed in my district one of the largest naval-ammunition depots in the country. It took out of taxation one-fourth of one county. I have a letter here from one of the schools involved, which states:

We are educating about 500 from the Spencer Park area. Our only source of help for this is about \$15,000 Federal Public Housing pays in lieu of taxes. The personal tax from this area is almost negligible. Our per pupil cost in Hastings this past year is \$120.52. This means that we get about \$15,000 FHFA money to apply on an approximate \$60,000 expense.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the projects under consideration today may be described as war casualties. I have two of them in my district. They would not have been there except because of activity created by war conditions.

I appreciate the position of the gentlemen who oppose this legislation on the general proposal that they do not favor Federal aid to education. The projects under consideration today do not come under that category. I call attention to the fact that the Government is now collecting from the project in my district known as Planeview, at the rate of about \$500,000 a year. We are only asking that the Government return a part of that fund to be used for the support of education of the children in that project. There are about 2,500 children who must have school facilities. The State, the county, and the district are contributing all they can under the law. We are asking for the return of a part of the \$500,000 in rent that goes to the Federal Treasury and is paid by the people who live in the community.

If you follow the plan submitted by some of the members by taking the project away, it means that someone is going to assume the responsibility for selling

these houses and sending the people back to the States and communities from whence they came. The people are there—half of the families are veterans' families. We have told veterans we were going to provide houses for them. Until other homes are provided, the best we can do is to let them use the temporary housing now in existence.

It is said we should tax the property. The fact is the property has little tax value. The project I have in mind is far removed from any city. It was put there where people could live while employed in war industry. They do pay a small amount of taxes that are applied on the cost of running the school.

I respect very much the views of the distinguished gentleman from New York, but the top figure involved is \$5,000,000. I am just as much in favor of saving \$5,000,000 as anyone on the floor of the House, and I agree that the House has been extravagant in some of its expenditures. Only a few days ago this House was very liberal in appropriating funds for other purposes. I am not criticizing those items now, and I do not compare this proposal with them. This proposal must stand on its own merits. I just want to say that it is rather inconsistent to oppose this legislation, which after all is simply asking the Federal Government to return about 20 to 25 percent of the rent that it collects from the people who live in these projects, so that a program of education for the children may be continued.

Again, let me say I am in favor of the counties, the States and the districts doing their full share. They are doing it in this particular case. I join too with those who say that this legislation should be temporary. We will hope at least that the situation may be adjusted so these people may be able to secure homes without the necessity of living in Government-owned temporary houses.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a local problem, although many of us have a local interest in it. It involves 367,000 school children in this country in 35 States. Only 127,000 of those 367,000 are there because of the war. The rest of the students were residents of little districts that were existing and sustaining themselves pretty well until this war bulge came to their areas. This increased their enrollment in many districts as high as 80 to 90 percent. For the 193 schools affected it boosted total enrollment by more than 45 percent.

Now, what do we do if we fail to give this aid that is asked today? We not only penalize the 127,000 students who are war-located, but we penalize all the rest of the 367,000 students, the permanent students, by giving them all only a 5- or 6-month term. Uncle Sam is solely responsible for the placement of all of this added enrollment in these small communities.

In my own community, if this war installation had been located within Oklahoma City, a city of 250,000 population, we would not have had to ask for any help whatever. But because of war re-

strictions they had to build this war housing area 8 miles out of the city, separated from other school districts of the city, and place it in a little farming community, and we thus had this unusual war burden there.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York who has worked so hard on this proposition.

Mr. GWINN of New York. I wonder if this property which is in Oklahoma is of such little taxable value that the Governor and the county affected would like to see it moved away.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think they would, because we feel we are still making a great contribution in servicing B-29 airplanes at this locality. Much has been said about the failure of these communities to do anything about financing their own problem. Yet \$15,000,000 a year additional revenue has been raised by these little districts to carry not only their own load but the load that Uncle Sam placed on them.

The tax burden has gone up more than 34 percent, as a national average, on all of these school districts that are affected. In my own community, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman, we have raised our ad valorem tax by 25 percent. We are trying to do our job. We have increased our school income from the State of Oklahoma from automobile licenses by 26 percent. We have raised from the State aid funds to this school district another increase of 34 percent.

I still say the locality is doing a mighty good job in trying to solve this problem themselves. But they cannot meet and solve this problem overnight. They could not build commercial enterprises in this place because materials were limited. Every man knows that unless you have some business which you can tax, in addition to residence property, you cannot maintain school districts, because revenue from a residential community only, without business taxation cannot give you the revenue for the type of education you must have.

You may say, "Cut down the amount you are spending for schools." The State of Oklahoma recognized the great deficiency in State teachers' salaries, and made it mandatory that we raise the teachers' salaries in every school district. They are still too small, but in order to qualify as a regular school, we had to increase the cost of operating this small school outside of Oklahoma City in order to pay the teachers enough salary. We are asking for only \$5,000,000 to take care of this war-born emergency for one more year for these 367,000 children affected.

I hope the House will support this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse and recommend the passage of H. R. 3682, known as the Landis bill. This bill which proposes to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments should be and must be passed immediately in order that the school districts under consideration in this bill may continue to stay in operation and educate the children in their respective districts. Without this aid a lot of the schools will have to curtail their teaching to a period of 4 or 5 months while others may not be able to operate at all.

To give some justification for the existence and passage of this bill it is necessary to understand the problems of the various school districts involved and the hardships under which they have been laboring and are laboring.

In its all-out war effort the United States Government built huge housing projects and developments near large shipyards, airplane factories, powder plants, and so forth, in an attempt to attract badly needed workers to the various yards and plants. Other housing projects were built in communities near Army, Navy, and marine installations to house the families of the servicemen and the civilian employees at the bases. These housing developments were Federal projects and as such, could not be taxed by the local communities. With the removal of large tracts of land from the tax books and with the sudden influx of large families of workers and service personnel, it is easy to visualize the magnitude of the impact of this situation upon the financial set-ups of the school systems in the affected areas.

In one area alone, Mobile, Ala., the sudden migration of shipyard workers into the Mobile area with their families resulted in the attendance in the schools increasing from 20,510 to 30,252. One district, Planeview, Kans., had no school district before the war; in 1943-44 the district had over 2,500 children in school. This same situation occurred in 408 different communities all over the Nation.

The Federal Government realized the burden placed on these communities and under a bill known as the Lanham Act agreed to pay these communities certain sums of money in lieu of taxes. The bill which we have under consideration merely extends for 1 year the provisions of the Lanham Act.

The school authorities in the several States were told last year that they should not expect the extension provided in this act since it was contemplated at that time, that the FPHA units would be disposed of before another school year started. If these units had been disposed of and placed in the hands of private owners there would be no need for the passage of H. R. 3682 but the fact of the matter is that they have not been disposed of and therefore still pose a serious problem involving the absence of large amounts of property from local tax books. As long as this property is owned by the

Federal Government it will be the duty of the Congress of the United States to provide in some way for the education of children living in these projects.

It has been intimated that the same request embodied in the Landis bill will be repeated next year but I would like to call to your attention the fact that this Congress has ordered all FPFA projects to be disposed of by the last day of next year. When this is done there will be no further need for this kind of legislation.

Local authorities have done everything possible to take care of this situation by raising local taxes to the legal limit. It is a local problem but it is a Federal obligation. I am in favor of economy in government as my record in this Congress will indicate but I am not willing to effect economy at the expense of children who are in need of education and who find themselves in a situation where the local authorities cannot take care of their needs. This legislation is a part of the cost of World War II and Congress should take care of its obligation by passing this bill.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I can but believe that those Members who are opposing this small appropriation to assist in the education of children in these war-burdened areas are doing so under a misapprehension of the facts. They have their facts all wrong.

My State of Texas, in proportion to its size at least, probably has fewer communities that have this problem than most of the States. However, we do have a few. I have some in my own district. They are the French Independent School District, the Vidor School District, the Orange Independent School District, and the Groves Independent School District.

I think I can best help those of you who are not familiar with the problem to understand it by taking a typical example of what these communities have to overcome; and this situation exists throughout the Nation in at least 35 States. I will take that of Orange, Tex. The argument is made that when more industries settle in a place they have great property values there and that the States and communities ought to finance this burden by themselves. All right; let us see what happened.

In about 1940 the Consolidated Steel Corp. of California came down to Orange and they found the combination of deep-water facilities and other things they needed to carry on their great operations. They put in a great shipyard and during the war turned out some of the finest destroyers, destroyer escorts, and other types of naval ships, and they employed over 20,000 workers in these yards. Two other yards there expanded and as a result this small city of some 15,000 or 20,000 people found itself suddenly swelled to 60,000 with no increase in the taxable wealth of the community. Before the war the Orange Independent School District had a scholastic population of 2,000. At present it has 6,200. During the war, as a result of the naval-

building program, the FPFA constructed about 3,500 public housing units which now house naval personnel, civilian employees, and veterans. Approximately 45 percent of the school-age population of this independent school district live in this housing project. FPFA pays, in lieu of taxes, about 25 percent of the cost of education of these children. The other 75 percent, except for the State apportionment, must be borne by the Orange Independent School District. Due to war restrictions on building there has been comparatively little expansion of privately owned business within the school district. And in addition to that, the Navy has acquired a considerable portion of the waterfront property that was formerly privately owned and subject to taxation and thus removed it from the tax rolls. Such business expansion as is now taking place is largely outside the school district.

Let me show you what the community has done. In an effort to meet the educational emergency the people of Orange increased their tax levy for school purposes from \$1 to \$1.50 on the \$100, the constitutional limit within 25 cents of the ad valorem tax levied in the District of Columbia for all purposes. In addition to that, their board of equalization raised the property value, for school purposes, to approximately 100 percent of actual value. Thus, they have done everything within their power to meet their problem. Nevertheless, unless they receive aid this coming year their school term will be reduced from its normal 9 months to approximately 6 months. As pointing up this problem of the plight of children temporarily living in these communities which have a war-swollen population, I should like to read from a very fine editorial appearing in the Orange, Tex., Leader, recently. It was written by Mr. J. Cullen Browning, its editor. The editorial is too long for me to read in full in the brief time that I have. It starts out by saying:

The other evening one of my neighbors came over to chat for a while and during the conversation brought up a subject which is bothering a lot of people in Orange and a number of other places these days. His thought on the matter, I believe, will be of interest.

This neighbor is a young fellow, not long out of the Navy. He is a native of an Eastern State who was stationed here for some time before receiving his discharge. Before being separated from service he moved his family, a wife and a 6-year-old daughter to Orange. While in uniform here he got a lot of experience in helping to prepare for lay-up some of the 130 ships of the Navy stationed here as part of the Atlantic reserve fleet. When he was discharged, the Navy still needed that experience so he accepted a civil-service position and now supervises a crew of men working on the ships.

My neighbor doesn't know just how much longer he will be needed in his present job—there's much talk of further expansion of the berthing operation here—but he wants to stay on and help to finish the task because he knows that one day he may be called back into service to man one of the very ships he is now laboring to protect from deterioration. He is anxious to do everything he can to be sure that if these vessels are needed again they will be in shape to go forth to battle as good as they were the day they began their maiden voyage.

This desire to help finish an important task in the proper manner is strong with my neighbor—very strong, in fact, but it has its limitations. Right now the principal limitation is centered around the 6-year-old blond cherub who is the pride and joy of this veteran and his wife; but my neighbor and his wife hear, with considerable degree of accuracy, that because of reduction in Federal contributions to the school system here with no means provided for compensating revenue, the next school term may have to be reduced from 9 to 6 months. So they face a big problem: Shall they stay on here and gamble on passage by the Congress of the Lanham Act extension, or shall they seek a means of livelihood in some community where a full term of school is assured.

The editorial then goes on to say:

All agree, that given time, we can work out our schools' financial problems and carry our own burden, which we prefer to do. But before we can stand on our own feet in this respect, we're going to need a little help, else we're going to wobble a bit at first. This assistance can come from only one source, the Federal Government, the activities of which placed us in our present embarrassing position.

To sum up, the State of Texas and the people of Orange have done a tremendously fine job in providing funds for supporting the public free schools. The Legislature of Texas, at its recent session, increased the appropriations for public free schools in Texas from about \$35 to \$55 per pupil. Those funds are allocated for the benefit of the children living in this Government housing project on exactly the same basis it is to the children of permanent status. The city of Orange and its school district have done everything possible within the law in raising taxation to the limit. But the city of Orange, like many communities in Texas, maintains a very fine public school system and the cost is about \$110 per pupil. And because so large a percentage of the entire school population lives in this Federal housing project their school term will be reduced from 9 months to 6 months unless Federal aid is extended. All this bill would do is provide for the Federal Government to supplement the available funds of the school district so they can operate their normal 9 months of school.

In conclusion I would remind you that only yesterday this House passed a bill which will have the effect of subsidizing lead, copper, and zinc mines of the Nation which are so far depleted they cannot be economically operated without such help. The subsidy will total more than \$70,000,000 annually. That was done because for the safety and defense of this country it was felt it was necessary for these mines to continue to operate. But I want to say that we have another war-produced problem of educating 367,000 children scattered around over this Nation by reason of war activities—it is a national problem. While we are subsidizing privately owned mines let us not withhold a little subsidy to educate these school children of the Nation.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the debate on

this bill. I am not so sure but what it has gone a little far afield. I think I am probably as tight as any Scotchman in this House, especially when it comes to the point of spending Federal money, but I am not willing to pinch pennies when it involves the future of our children for whom we all must assume responsibility.

In this particular situation the Federal Government brought about these conditions. I do not think there is one person within the sound of my voice who would question for 1 minute the responsibility of the Government in this instance. We can theorize all we please, we can think up any kind of hypothetical picture we might want to, but the responsibility remains. May I say that so far as I know there is not one dollar of this money going into my district, but I do know something about things that have taken place there. I know that the concentration of these large numbers of floating population has brought about a very serious situation in some of these poor school districts. You can say that the Housing Authority ought to pay so much money or that the law says so-and-so, but they do not do it, but the fact remains that the burden of taxes to provide for these schools must rest on the property, and property owners, and it can reach destructive proportions.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. What about these communities the gentleman speaks of that did not get their contracts placed before the war ended under the Lanham Act and have had to go out and build their schools with bond issues?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say whether they got the contracts completed or not, whether the population that exists there is making good money or whether the salaries are good or whether the chamber of commerce wants them there has no bearing on the existing facts and conditions. That is the thing I am looking at. My district is chock full of New York and other auto licenses right now and they are not even willing to buy a license, much less pay an ad valorem tax or pay a tax for the support of schools unless somebody chokes it out of them. You have heard me in the well of this House say that this floating population is constantly bringing about problems. What I want to do is live long enough to see the Federal Government get out of my district as far as owning houses and renting to people are concerned. I want the homes in my district owned by people who live there or owned by private citizens; then according to our tax structure they can make their normal proper and expected contributions to the community and to the community projects, such as schools and so forth. But so long as the Housing Authority or any other branch of the Federal Government goes in there and continues to own these houses and rent them, then pinch off a few pennies and drop them into the General Treasury, we are going to be confronted with the very problems we are

confronted with right now, except more of them.

This bill strikes me as being the fair and proper thing for the Federal Government to do. It is a fair contribution for the Federal Government to make. The matter of Federal support of schools has no place in the argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, those who are interested in my opinion on this question will find my remarks on pages 248 and 249 of the hearings. I want to say that I am strongly in favor of this bill and I hope it passes. It is only children who will suffer if we fail to pass it.

This is strictly a Federal Government responsibility. In congested school districts the relief for which is intended to be provided in this bill, the children in large numbers were brought in by their parents who went to the location to do war work. Thousands of these children are still in the same location. The result is a "hang-over" from the war effort. The Lanham act that did provide Federal money for such schools to some extent during the war was passed by the Congress as the right thing to do. Since these parents displaced by the war effort are still in the location and the children are there too it naturally follows that this financial support must be tapered off, that is, not abruptly stopped; and relief should be given at this time for this one additional year.

The need of such school districts in many instances is great. If this bill is not passed, teachers cannot be hired, the school term will be shortened, and the education of thousands of children will suffer. This is a direct and definite harm to a part of the citizenship of our country and to these children now deprived of educational opportunity. Many of the school districts congested by the war effort were barely able to finance their own school responsibilities before the war even though in many cases they were taxing themselves to the extreme limit under the law. The influx of so many children increased the school's responsibility for these districts far beyond their financial ability to provide educational opportunity. This condition remains in a number of school districts, hence the authorization of money for financial relief to such districts should be enacted into law as provided by the bill now under discussion.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3682 which extends the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments is a good bill which I shall support and vote for. It supplies a very urgent need in my district which felt the full impact of the war ef-

fort. Many thousands of war workers with their families moved into the Puget Sound area of the great State of Washington to become employed in war industries. The local schools were required to extend their services to thousands of additional children. This increased burden required Federal financial aid; and Congress, recognizing that fact, passed the Lanham Act which provided the needed funds.

Although the hostilities have been over for approximately 2 years the need for Federal aid in certain areas still remains. The housing projects are occupied by former war workers and war veterans whose children attend the local schools. Children of military personnel residing on military reservations also attend these schools, overtaxing their facilities. While local school districts are doing everything they can within the limits of State law it is not enough. They need this Federal aid urgently, and I trust that the House will pass this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3682. This bill provides relief of a very bad situation in my State, and my district particularly, which was incurred by the tremendous war effort. The shipyards and Boeing plant in Seattle and the Navy yard at Bremerton, where 23,000 units of housing were built and the population increased from 25,000 to 85,000 in less than 3 years, the assessed valuation of the county has not increased accordingly. The naval installations being exempt from taxation, it is absolutely necessary for the provisions of H. R. 3682 to become law in order for our school system to exist.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, owing to war conditions, the Government moved great numbers of people into various areas where school facilities were not available. In my own district in southern California the population doubled between 1940 and 1946. Great public housing projects were built. Thousands of children attended schools which the Government helped to build and to maintain.

Now, with the war a thing of the past, and with the communities concerned still not getting normal taxes from the wartime population, which shows no indication of returning to their former homes, some provision must be made for the education of the children concerned. It seems to me to be the duty of the Government to help in this matter.

I am wholly in favor of this proposed legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable authorities which are still overburdened with war-incurred school enrollments to meet their needs during the transition from war-time conditions, the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to continue to make during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949. Contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, Federal contributions administered by him for the maintenance and operation of their school facilities. Appropriations and existing appropriations heretofore authorized (to the Federal Works Administrator) for similar purposes are hereby authorized to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "years" and insert "year".

Page 1, line 8, strike out "and June 30, 1949. Contributions" and insert "contribution".

At the end of the bill insert "The amount hereinbefore authorized shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1948."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My colleagues, I am a little bit amused to still see people worried about the threat of Federal intervention in the cause of education when, as a matter of fact, this Congress has authorized and is now spending about \$1,800,000,000 this year in the field of education to educate the GI's in accordance with the terms of the so-called GI bill. But, being somewhat of a realist, after listening to the rather emotional appeals on both sides in behalf of little children, I would like to call your attention to what appears to me to be the nub of this situation.

The report on this bill, on page 2, says:

It is estimated that approximately 103 schools will still be unable to provide normal school services during the 1947-48 school year without this assistance.

That means that the assistance will have to start to flow at the beginning of the school year, or before, in order that the teachers may be hired and the schools be in readiness for the fall term. If you pass this bill will these funds be available? Is there any way that you can get this money and get it into circulation and get it out to these schools that you say need it to keep them going? If you are not able to get the money, then there will not be any education, as you say, for these little children.

Now, let us see what the facts are. I just called up the Federal Works Agency in order to find out what the condition of their present available funds are. On June 30 they had available \$2,248,092 of unexpended balances. By virtue of the passage of the Independent Offices appropriation bill \$500,000 of that sum was transferred for the purpose of liquidation of this agency, and \$5,100,000 was rescinded so that there will be available for expenditure on the passage

of the independent offices bill—and I may say that there is no dispute between the Senate and House with respect to this item, so it will be in the bill—by the Public Works Agency \$648,092 as soon as that bill gets the President's signature, and that \$648,092 has been allocated for expenditure by the Federal Works Agency in order to carry out contracts and commitments already made. Therefore there is no money and will be no money available to carry out this legislation in order to make it available for expenditure at the beginning of the next school year unless you are able to get this bill passed by this body and get it passed by the Senate and get a supplemental estimate up before the Committee on Appropriations and get that passed by this body and by the Senate.

As I told you yesterday, if this House is going to adjourn Saturday night, and I believe it will, despite all the tears and all the emotional appeal that has been made this morning on behalf of the little children who need an education, the realistic, practical thing facing us here is, how are we going to get this money and have it made available to the Public Works Agency? This seems to be a situation where, as far as the merits of this proposition are concerned, it comes too late. I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and, knowing the decision that has been made heretofore in that committee, I am of the opinion it will be impossible to get this bill passed by the other body and get a budget estimate up here to be considered by the Deficiency Committee in time to have it included in the final supplemental bill that will come before this Congress today or tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not perfectly clear, therefore, that this bill comes before the Congress too late to effectuate the purposes you have in mind? It seems to me this is the greatest and grossest illustration of the lack of harmony that exists between the legislative committees of this House and the Committee on Appropriations. The Public Works Agency had \$6,248,092 available when the independent offices bill came in here. I did not hear a single man from this committee question the advisability of rescinding \$5,100,000 of that appropriation, which was carried in the bill. As the result, that rescission has taken place, and there will not be any money available to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. How will the committees that are going to travel abroad get their money? If they can get their money to go abroad, we can get this money.

Mr. KEEFE. That is a very academic thing for my friend to ask. Having been in this Congress now nearly 10 years, he understands the appropriation machinery. I am calling attention to a reality, to a fact. I am doing it because I want the schools of this Nation that will be affected—and mind you I am making no argument against this bill—and the school children that will be affected by the lack of money to carry this program out to know that we are not holding out a false hope to them that they are going to have funds available, when, as a matter of fact, I personally can see no way in which, if this Congress is going to adjourn on Saturday night, you can make these funds available.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. How much time is usually required in order to obtain an estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on a matter of this sort?

Mr. KEEFE. That can be accomplished very rapidly. If the House and Senate wanted to work their will it could be done. But may I say that I do not believe the Committee on Appropriations is just going to come in here with a blanket appropriation for \$5,000,000 to implement this program without holding any hearings to show what is necessary, at least in the face of the strong minority report on this bill. I cannot speak for the committee, but I can speak for myself as an individual member of that committee. I think we just do not have the time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I agree there is much in what the gentleman says in that this bill is being considered late. Of course, those of us who sponsored it started early enough, and it is unfortunate that we have just been able to bring it to the floor. But getting down to the gentleman's question, and I am sure he is trying to be helpful, if this bill passes the House today and if the other body passes it, cannot the other body make provision in the supplemental deficiency bill to take care of that situation?

Mr. KEEFE. All things are possible, may I say, in the late hours of any Congress. I have learned that since I have been here. It is very possible you have the persuasive power to go to the other body and get them to pass this bill before they take action on the supplemental estimate that is over there. You might be able to put this in although they have not had any hearings on it. I understand their hearings are complete. Perhaps the gentleman knows that procedure better than I do because he has been here a long time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, as always, is interested in not only expressing a hope for action but in

carrying out that hope. I realize there is much truth in what the gentleman says.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.
Mr. LANDIS. Is not this practically the same thing as we had in the mineral bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is largely true. The situation we find ourselves in here is that this bill came up early in January, and the proponents of the bill have been seeking to bring about a satisfactory compromise between the many elements affected. The particular compromise bill was introduced by the chairman on the 2d of June and was reported to the House on the 20th of June. We have had considerable time to get to it, but I realize the exigencies of a crowded program.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The thing that surprises me, may I say to my friend, is that with the knowledge on the part of the Public Works Agency of the existence of this bill, and I assume that they examined it and must have made a report on it, it is rather impossible for me to understand why the Federal Works Agency did not offer some resistance to the rescission of \$5,000,000 of their unobligated funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe I can explain that to the gentleman and to the House. The \$5,000,000 was earmarked for the construction of municipal and school facilities. This bill is not connected with construction. This is only for current school operation. That money was rescinded and we had no authority under law by which we can appropriate \$5,000,000 or transfer \$5,000,000 of funds and we were merely living up to the rules of the House in not seeking to appropriate without a proper authorization.

I am sure the gentleman will find that to be the absolute case. Therefore, we could not transfer those funds without legislative authority.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman realizes, of course, that I have raised a question here of vital importance.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is a most important question.

Mr. KEEFE. If you are going to get this through and do anything about it, it must receive some hasty action. Otherwise, you are going to fool these school boys.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate that. The gentleman has been very helpful. Those of us who are interested in this vital program have been pressing for action for weeks trying to get this matter up. Regardless of whether Congress adjourns without making this \$5,000,000 appropriation, if it now authorizes the \$5,000,000, these schools will start their sessions in the middle of September. Then we will have half of September, October, November, and December before Congress comes back. That is 3½ months.

If we authorize this appropriation, almost every one of these schools will have courage and will have the hope that Congress will vitalize the authorization with an appropriation in January.

And if that does not happen, then they can cut back their schedules after January. But if we adjourn now without this

authorization and come back in January, the schools will be out before Congress could even authorize this money, let alone appropriate it. So, I say we are not making an idle gesture.

The Committee on Appropriations may be able to get this into a supplemental bill, but if they cannot it can still be vitalized by a deficiency appropriation in January when only 3 or 3½ months of the school year has expired.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to supplement what the gentleman from Wisconsin said.

The Federal Works Agency is not only in liquidation, it has no personnel by which it can administer this fund if the \$5,000,000 should be granted. They have already said in a letter to the committee dated June 17, 1947, by Mr. P. F. Seward, Federal Works Commissioner, as follows:

As Mr. Field explained to the committee, our bureau had not anticipated carrying forward this program during the 1947-48 school year. As a result we had not contacted the school districts to procure estimates as we did not want the school districts to feel that there was any probability of a continuation of this program

Now, here is the Federal Works Agency that has administered this fund up until this time, in contact with the facts in each district, and they did not believe they ought to lead the people to think that they could have this fund any longer. They had notified the communities to make their own arrangements. They have had 2 years within which to do it. The thing is over as far as the Federal Works Agency is concerned.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If you pass this bill you have to find some agency to administer it and pay the expense of administration. The gentleman says that the Federal Works Agency did not anticipate this. I hold in my hand a breakdown from the Federal Works Agency giving every penny that would be spent on every project, the average attendance, and the whole history of the case.

Mr. GWINN of New York. The gentleman may realize that that has to do with the past year. They have no data for this year.

Mr. WHEELER. They have estimated the deficit.

Mr. GWINN of New York. They appeared before our committee and made no suggestion that they were ready to administer this fund.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair and I know he would not make a misstatement about this matter.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Thank you.

Mr. COLMER. But it so happens that I have just been talking with Mr. Seward of the Public Works Agency, to whom the gentleman referred, and they are prepared to carry out and administer this bill.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Even though they are in liquidation?

Mr. COLMER. Even though they are in liquidation. They are making their plans.

Mr. GWINN of New York. And in spite of this letter I have just read, saying that they had made no inducements and had already told the people they should not expect further funds.

Mr. COLMER. Let me answer the gentleman to this extent: It is not the function of the Federal Works Agency to go out and tell people what to do, or to tell Congress what to do. This proposition emanated from the Congress and not the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. GWINN of New York. But it is the function of the Federal Works Agency to carry out the instructions of Congress last year, which was to notify these people that there would be no more funds—no more dipping into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. COLMER. It is the duty of the Federal Works Agency to administer this act if Congress passes it.

Mr. GWINN of New York. And the Federal Works Agency thought they had administered it, and the work was over, and it ought to be over.

Mr. COLMER. They will administer it if we pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not disturbed or alarmed about these two straw men that have been constructed this morning in an attempt to prevent the passage of the pending legislation.

First of all, the Federal Works Agency is not going to be liquidated. It will be in process of business next year.

Second, I am not disturbed about the fact that there may not be any funds for payment to the schools, under the provisions of this bill. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I want to say to you that if this Congress passes authorizing legislation saying that the Appropriations Committee shall make available \$5,000,000 in Federal funds for the payments under provisions of the proposed bill, your Appropriations Committee will function accordingly, and will present to this House an appropriation bill providing the money.

We are servants of the House. I think the bill should be passed with probably some amendments. If Congress cannot provide the funds before we adjourn and if we do not have a special session, the Congress will convene on January 3, 1948, and I am certain that if there is authorizing legislation the money will be made available for use during the next school year, and that is the period of time the pending bill covers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the Congress does pass an authorizing piece of legislation it does not bind the Appropriations Committee; the Appropriations Committee may or may not act. That should be under-

stood. I think, however, one or two facts about the history of this legislation may help to clarify the situation. Some of these facts may have been related already but unfortunately I have had to be in a committee hearing and do not know just what has been said here.

The reason the Federal Works Agency did not prepare some estimates is because under the terms of the legislation passed last year which limited this program to 1 year, it would not have been proper for them to do so.

In the minority report which is before us I notice the Members who sign it say that a little over \$1,400,000 is needed. Perhaps that is all that is required, I do not know. Personally, I do not believe that \$5,000,000 will be required. I think it will be somewhere between one and a half and three million dollars.

The reason the Federal Works Agency did not prepare some estimates in addition is because it is true I think, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buck], said, that Congress had said it did not want to carry on this program this year. The Federal Works Agency is not an educational agency. The first legislation introduced in this Congress to deal with this problem dealt with a broader problem than the one now before us, dealt with the children of parents who were employed on Federal reservations of various kinds, in the national parks and forests, on the grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission, where the atomic energy plants are in operation, and on military and naval establishments.

As a matter of fact today the children of parents who live on the grounds of the atomic energy plants and work there are having their children's education paid for by Federal funds and the children are being treated on a much more generous scale than children who live on a normal military reservation or in one of these war-created housing projects. The children of employees of the Navy are taken care of because last year the Congress passed an omnibus bill to authorize certain appropriations for the Navy Department and it contained a provision authorizing appropriation for the education of children who live on naval reservations. Funds were carried in the Navy appropriation bill this year for that purpose.

To fail to take care of children who happen to live on military reservations or who happen to live on Federal property in these war-housing projects would be an unfair discrimination the way the situation rests today.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree with everything the gentleman has said. I think the necessity in this case demands that we pass this legislation but I think the gentleman is perhaps making a distinction that is not quite in keeping, because in the case of military reservations and so forth the children taken care of are children of people employed in connection with the reservation, whereas the parents of children in these projects may be working for the gentleman's business or my business, anyway, some private business. They are living in this hous-

ing that was constructed during wartime when the houses were used for people employed on work for the Federal Government, but they are no longer so employed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman makes a point in which there is some merit. The difficulty is that this war housing may be the only housing available.

The particular project in which I happen to be interested, however, is where children are living on a military reservation and the parents are working for the Government. In this school district which embraces this military reservation there are 12 children of parents who live outside the military reservation, and over 500 who live on the military reservation. Obviously, the parents of 12 children, the people who live on a few farms around this isolated military reservation cannot dig up taxes enough from the 12 farms to provide schooling for five-hundred-odd children who live on the military reservation. That indicates the general merit of this proposal.

I join with other members who urge passage of this bill, at this time, and, at the same time, urge that legislation be enacted to meet the problem in the future. Perhaps we can make a portion of the rents collected directly available for school purposes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: Page 1, line 10, page 2, line 1, after the word "assistance" on page 1, line 10, strike out the words "that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 3682 in its present form. If it is to pass, my amendment, being the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, should be adopted. Other Members have indicated the need of this kind of legislation. I desire to call attention to a situation in my district.

North Chicago School District No. 64 received no funds from the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. This amendment would permit North Chicago School District No. 64 to make application for funds through the Bureau of Community Facilities, Federal Works Agency, to take care of additional costs for schooling of children of veterans living on a portion of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center property.

Since the end of the war, two of the Great Lakes Naval Training Center camps formerly occupied by naval personnel have been remodeled by the State Housing Authority to provide homes for former GI's. This is still Federal property, but leased to the State.

North Chicago School District No. 64 includes three elementary schools, with a normal enrollment of 600 children. The increase in enrollment due to the housing project will be approximately 200 children of GI's, or a 33-percent increase. It will be necessary to employ 8 additional teachers and provide space of 8 classrooms. The district must also

provide transportation for these children coming from the housing project, a distance of 1½ miles, but within the boundaries of the school district.

It is estimated that the loss of revenue from taxes by school district No. 64 is approximately \$20,000 a year due to acquisition of this land by the Federal Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman just strike out the language referring to June 30, 1947?

Mr. CHURCH. If you will look at the bottom of page 1, line 10, my amendment reads: "Strike the words 'that have received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947.'" That is all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman leaves in the requirement they must have previously qualified for these Federal funds.

Mr. CHURCH. No. I strike no other words out of the bill. The school district must be able to qualify.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment with great reluctance. I have considerable sympathy for the problem of the gentleman from Illinois, and if his amendment were confined to his particular project, his particular school there, I would not object. But what his amendment does is open up the whole field to all schools that at any time received the benefits of the Lanham Act. In other words, under the bill as written, no school, that is, a school that was not eligible for benefits this year, can qualify, but if his amendment is adopted, any school that had received benefits back in the war period could apply and receive funds.

Now, what does that mean? That means that this \$5,000,000 that the bill limits the appropriation to would have to be spread out so thin that the schools really requiring aid would not get it. It would not go very far. I have just taken it upon myself before opposing this amendment, because I did not want to oppose it unless it was necessary, to discuss this matter with the authorities in the Public Works Administration over the telephone, and they tell me that it would make it most difficult of administration; that it would have to be spread out so thin that they did not know whether the schools that were really entitled to it and needed it most would get it, and they are opposed to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I say to the gentleman that I have just examined the amendment as it is at the desk, and if the amendment should be adopted as is, it would do violence to the English language, because it would leave hanging in the air a phrase like this, "contributions for the operation and maintenance of school facilities to local school agencies requiring assistance,

Federal contributions administered by him for the maintenance and operation."

Mr. COLMER. It makes no sense whatever. I did not comment on that, although I observed the same thing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois merely struck out the words "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947" it would make some sense. It might still be hard to administer, for then it would leave in the words "that have received Federal contributions."

Mr. COLMER. I assumed that that is what the gentleman from Illinois had in mind.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. I understood what the gentleman was driving at, but that still does not alter the difficulties of administration. Not only that, but if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, then the figure "\$5,000,000" ought to be stricken, and it either ought to be left without a figure or it ought to be increased to \$10,000,000. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes, but I would like to get some information from the chairman of the committee. Can the gentleman tell us how the towns that are listed to receive benefits from this act were selected?

Mr. LANDIS. I could not say how they were selected, except that the ones that received it last year have made the request for next year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What is bothering me is that there are many communities in the State of Connecticut that have housing projects built under the Lanham Act. There are several in my congressional district. In the whole State of Connecticut there is only one town, the town of Groton, in the district of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] that is on this list.

Mr. LANDIS. During the war all these areas were investigated by the Federal Works Agency, and those that were in need were given assistance such as is here provided.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The thing I am afraid of is that some towns have moved a little more rapidly than others. I know the communities involved. Certainly the city of Groton is as well able financially to deal with the problem, as are several other towns that have Lanham housing. I cannot see any justification for appropriating for the town of Groton in the State of Connecticut

and leaving out every other town that has Lanham housing.

I want to be correct about this. Do not these towns and cities receive from the Lanham Act projects a sum of money in lieu of taxes?

Mr. LANDIS. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot see any difference whether these be Government-owned projects or privately owned projects, they are taxed on the same basis. Everybody knows that a so-called bedroom community has difficulty raising tax money for education and other purposes. It does not complicate the situation just because these projects are owned by the Government. I can see no justification for this \$5,000,000.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The problem the gentleman points out is one about which I think a great many Members of the House are confused. It goes to the very kernel of this problem, as to how the problem is created. It is created this way: When you apply the traditional tax rates to the values of these properties and make these communities live within tax limitations and tax revenues that were intended to be applied to housing units and commercial properties of much higher per capita cost, you do not get sufficient amounts of money to run the schools and educate children in conformance with our traditional standards. It is very easy to use an extreme situation and arrive at the same result. Suppose that all the residents of a school district lived in tents. I think the gentleman can well understand that such a situation would necessitate substantial adjustments to existing tax rates and tax limitation laws.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot yield further. I get the gentleman's point. But that is exactly the same thing in any privately owned property such as medium-cost housing, the so-called suburban bedroom community.

Mr. MACKINNON. Except that the disparity in tax values is greater in these cases.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is exactly the same, I may say to the gentleman. The housing is just as valuable or just as cheap, whichever way you look at it, whether it is owned by the Government or by private individuals. It does not change the situation one iota. In the community in which I live there is a project built under the Lanham Act of 120 families. It matters not to that community whether those houses are owned by the Federal Government or by private individuals, the dollar income to the town is the same.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Where you have military or naval reservations and the housing is on those reservations there is no provision whatsoever for making any contribution to the school district in lieu of taxes, because no levy can be made there.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. However, the communities about which I am concerned are not on Government reservations, it is war housing. From the list I have seen, most of the cities included on the list are cities that have war housing projects, not military reservations. I cannot see any justification for this appropriation of this \$5,000,000; certainly none have been presented either on the floor of the House or in the report.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by me be returned to the form in which I offered it. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I feel, has misunderstood it. The amendment as offered by me is in the proper form. The gentleman from South Dakota overlooks the fact that the comma is not stricken by my amendment and remains between the word "assistance" and the words "Federal contributions" and the gentleman failed to read the language in lines 3 to 8 preceding the word "contribution" in line 8. Of course, I did not prepare the bill and it is difficult to amend on the floor in its present form. Of course, I now understand that both the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are opposed to my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going to object, I will say that if you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois and someone, some way, straightens out the sentence so that it does not have a tortured meaning, you are opening the door to schools which never qualified for this aid before. You would be eliminating what the committee sought to do when it reported this legislation, which was to shrink this program and gradually extinguish it as the school districts take over and meet the problem themselves.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be restored to its original form as offered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, no one will ever accuse me of taking this floor to urge Federal contributions for local expenses. If I did not believe that a real and difficult problem existed as a reasonable aftermath of the war, I would not be in favor of this bill. I am in favor of the bill and shall support it.

I want to present to the House an example of what happened in one area of

my congressional district. I believe there are others in the Detroit, Mich., metropolitan area. I have a unit known as the Livonia Township School District which is contiguous to the city of Detroit. It is an area in close proximity to very large industrial plants which were engaged in the production of war materials during the war. The population of that district increased 42 percent during the war years. That district now has 441 high-school students who are being sent to 10 different high schools outside of the district. It does not have the means nor the taxable property to build a high school within the district at the present time. The people are taxing themselves to the limit of the law allowed in Michigan. If you were a member of the school board of that township, what would you do to provide reasonable school facilities for the children who have moved into that district because of the war effort?

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], for whom I have the highest respect.

Mr. GWINN of New York. As a school man, you know that the people in Detroit in that particular district are sending their children to other high schools, and they can pay and do pay tuition. That is the way we handle it. Is that not so?

Mr. DONDERO. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. This school board has already been notified by the different high schools to which these children were sent that they no longer will be able to provide for them. That will return the problem to the local school district. The Government already has recognized that the problem in this district is one which has been created by the war effort because Federal funds have been granted in two or three previous years.

There is the situation and unless some relief is granted by a bill such as this one, there is no way in which the school board in that area can provide reasonable, educational facilities for these children.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Would the gentleman tell us how long he thinks such a condition would continue—how many years does he think it might continue?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think that I can tell you, but I would say that I am not in favor of permanent legislation of this kind and if this bill were permanent legislation, I would vote against it.

Mr. BUCK. But the gentleman does think that it might be 2 years or 3 years before the State can solve the problem?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think it ought to run that long. I think the State will have to provide some way to meet this problem sooner or later and the quicker the better. But for one more year I think the Federal Government should assist in solving this problem, and I hope this bill passes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "to" add "(a)."

On page 2, after the word "facilities", strike out the period and add the following: "and (b) local school agencies requiring assistance that may be subject to a loss of tax revenues because of the acquisition or ownership of land by the United States."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to state, briefly, my problem.

During the war there was a large air base located about 8 miles out in the country from Stuttgart, Ark. The War Department purchased two sections of land in Prairie County, located in a very small, one-room, rural-school district. During the war those pupils went to school in Stuttgart in Arkansas County, Ark. The base has been closed. Last year it was vacant. We made no complaint about educating the children from this reservation. This year the Federal Government is using this reservation as a housing project. One hundred and forty-four students are living out there on a Federal reservation.

First of all, let me make this clear: The attorney general of Arkansas has held that these pupils living on this Federal reservation cannot be enumerated for school purposes. Will you get that, please? There is no way to enumerate them for school purposes in Arkansas, because they are living on a Federal reservation. There are no taxes that come from those students or their parents.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Military reservations have funds to take care of their own reservations. They know the situation, do they not?

Mr. NORRELL. That is not the question involved here. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will see that. There is no enumeration possible of the students living on this Federal reservation. They are not working for the Government. The people living there are living all over Prairie and Arkansas Counties. They have these children. The children cannot go to school now in the district in which they live, because they are living on a Federal reservation. And, because the school of the district in which the reservation is located out there is not sufficient to accommodate these 144 students. The only way they can get any aid is through the Federal Government.

With that explanation, may I say this: I would like the gentlemen of the committee to understand this: My amendment is not offering any new language to the present law. The bill before you is a duplication of the present law on this subject. I refer to Public Law No. 452 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The bill is, word for word, a duplication of the present law, except it has omitted one sentence that is in the present law. That is the sentence that I embody in my amendment.

To be short, and in conclusion, I would like for you to understand that if my amendment is adopted you are not adding one period or one comma or one word

to the present law. Our action will mean that we will reenact the present law for another year. That is all my amendment does. It makes no change whatsoever. I have conferred with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] and other members of the committee and it is perfectly agreeable to them, as I understand it. I hope, since no change would be made in the present law if my amendment is adopted, that you can see fit to adopt the amendment, because there is no money embodied in the amendment and because they have operated this year under the law, and I am asking that they simply operate next year under the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. As I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment it is to aid small school districts in his State and elsewhere to receive funds from the Government denied by the State because of inability of the districts to get enumeration funds.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct. If my amendment is adopted these children can go from the one-room schoolhouse in Prairie County to the Stuttgart public schools, and we will pay the difference.

Mr. TRIMBLE. In other words, it will enable the Government to pay to the district in which the reservation is located in the neighborhood of \$1,200, which is denied the district by reason of the ruling of the Attorney General.

Mr. NORRELL. That is correct. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and on the bill, close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. I object.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request to make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACKINNON. How many amendments are there on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. There is one more amendment on the desk.

The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to rise in opposition to the amendment, but I think the House is entitled to know just what insertion of this language now does.

The language reported by the committee in this bill limits this assistance to

schools that qualified for it during the year ending June 30, 1947. The language proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas adds "and local school agencies requiring assistance that may be subject to a loss of tax revenue because of the acquisition or ownership of lands by the United States."

It is possible that that might throw open to assistance all the school districts where the Government had acquired lands for national parks or national forests or many other purposes. That was proposed in the original bills but there was considerable opposition.

So the committee in reporting the bill sought to limit aid to those schools which qualified in the past year. This language I am afraid broadens the bill very materially.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Is not that the present law?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This sentence may be in the present law, but I think the present law refers to the Lanham Act which adds other requirements with regard to the incidence of the war in relation to the plight of any school. The bill before us is not a direct amendment to either the Lanham Act or the act of a year ago. I am afraid just to add this sentence here would make the act much broader than what was intended by the committee limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the argument made by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], particularly when he states that this is a program we should wind up as hurriedly as we can, but that it must be continued for another year. However, it is an aftermath of the war and is a condition that confronts us in many of the districts in the United States where we have a serious problem which is not a local problem, but purely a Federal one.

The bill provides Federal assistance for a pressing problem that has arisen out of the war and its aftermath. During the war period, thousands of war workers and their families migrated into war areas, greatly increasing school attendance and imposing severe financial burdens on local school systems. In addition, the school enrollment in many areas was greatly increased by children of civilian workers and military and naval personnel residing on military and naval reservations and other Federal installations. During the war the Federal Government recognized its responsibilities to these communities and granted assistance for the maintenance and operation of the schools in these areas. Such assistance has been made available under titles II and III of the Lanham Act. Without such assistance many of these schools would have been unable to provide school services for the increased population caused by this

war impact. Under the express provisions of the act, Federal agencies and officers are prohibited from interfering with or controlling the administration or operation of any school for which Federal aid is provided. This statutory prohibition is being observed by the Bureau of Community Facilities of the Federal Works Agency, the Federal agency responsible for the administration of this program.

Under existing law, this program of Federal assistance to schools will terminate on June 30, 1947. Many of these school systems, however, still are confronted with the same burdens and the same problems which made Federal assistance necessary in the first place. The end of hostilities has not yet brought about normal school conditions in many places. The war-engendered displacement and immigration of school children into war areas still presents a problem to many school authorities. In many of these areas the schools are still burdened with war-connected pupils. Their enrollments remain at or near the high wartime levels. From the testimony presented it is evident that this situation will continue in a large number of areas during the coming school year. The enrollment in the 181 schools receiving Federal assistance during the present school year was 115,000 pupils more than enrollment in the same schools during the last prewar normal year. This is an increase of more than 46 percent. These school enrollments continue at high levels in a number of places because air bases, Army camps, forts, ordnance depots, war plants, hospital centers, naval bases, and other war installations are still active. The children of the military and civilian personnel that are stationed at these posts to man these various installations are being provided school services by the local school authorities.

Defense housing continues to be occupied at capacity levels and indications are that this situation will continue next year. The problem is intensified by the shortage of housing and the increased need for veterans' housing. This situation further contributes to the continued high school enrollments in these areas.

It is believed that an impact of this magnitude, and its effect on the school economy, creates a financial problem completely out of balance with any reasonable adjustment that can be made in the tax structure or local revenues. Testimony presented to the committee indicates that unless this Federal aid is continued a number of these schools, affecting a large number of children, will not be able to operate more than 4 to 6 months. In view of the fact that school authorities cannot anticipate more than a 4 to 6 months' school term financed from their own funds, it is impossible with the present teacher shortage to induce qualified teaching personnel to accept positions in these school systems.

In my district we had one housing project, among many others, which was the largest in the United States. Over 30,000 war workers came into this one housing project which was built in a sparsely inhabited neighborhood in my congressional district. Many of those houses are still there. Many of the

workers are still there. A great many veterans are occupying these houses. Some of them have children of school age. These children, who are residents within these districts, are really foreign so far as our local districts are concerned. There were brought in there by reason of the war and the activities of the Federal Government and they are still there. For instance, there were brought into my district 25,000 colored people. Before the war we had about 1,800. A large portion of those colored citizens are still there. Some of them came from New York. They came from almost every State in the Union. We have a mild, agreeable climate. They like our citizens; they enjoy the beautiful landscape and pleasant surroundings, and they want to stay with us. They will not return to their former homes. They are there and these school districts have absolutely no way to finance their schools to take care of this heavy increase in school attendance. If you want to turn those youngsters out so that they will not receive any schooling, all good and well, but if you want them to receive a minimum of education, it is the problem of the Federal Government and Lanham Act funds must be continued for another year at least. Some school districts in my State cannot provide adequate schooling without these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill. I hope we will not become confused because there may be some question about the financing of the bill and for that reason vote it down. If we are unable to get finances before this Congress adjourns we will be in position to get them at the earliest possible moment later through supplemental appropriations or a deficiency act.

I hope everyone who is in favor of educating the children of this country and not saddling this temporary burden of the United States Government on local communities will vote favorably on this bill, H. R. 3682.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON: Page 2, line 8, after the period, insert "The additional Federal contributions herein authorized shall be paid from the rental income received by the Federal Works Agency from all such projects."

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is rather simple. I think it will get around the difficulty that might arise with respect to this legislation. This amendment simply provides that this amount of money shall be paid from the rental income. Now, gentlemen, that is exactly the same way that payments in lieu of taxes are made to these very same local agencies by the very same Administrators. I submit the

amendment is sound and should be adopted.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Does the gentleman mean that the Federal Works Agency shall pay this or the Federal Housing Authority, since they have the organization on the job to do it?

Mr. MacKINNON. I think the Federal Works Administrator is the proper agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman's language should refer to the Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman would consider amending that so as to make it "Federal Housing Authority," instead of "Federal Works Agency"?

Mr. MacKINNON. I will accept that amendment if the gentlemen who are primarily concerned with this feel it would be an improvement. I am merely trying to be helpful.

Mr. GWINN of New York. In that case I would like to join in supporting the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota may be modified as suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MacKINNON: On page 2, line 8, after the period, insert "The additional Federal contributions herein authorized shall be paid from the rental income received by the Federal Housing Authority from all such projects."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that the objective that he seeks, as I understand, by his amendment, is to overcome the possibility that an appropriation could not be made available to implement this legislation before the House adjourns, and he seeks to have this money made available by this amendment to the Federal Works Agency, to be paid by the Federal Works Agency that collects the rental on these projects, to make the necessary contributions.

Mr. MacKINNON. That is right. I merely offer this amendment as a suggestion to obviate that possible difficulty.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope the amendment carries, because that is a step in the right direction of implementing the purposes of this bill and assuring that it be implemented.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. With the permission of the gentleman who now has the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is an entirely practical manner of administration to handle it that way. If so, then I, too, am in accord with it.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, I am not an expert on the administration of the Federal Housing Authority. I cannot answer that question. But it would seem to me it would be perfectly reasonable to assume that if the same agency is able to make contributions to those local communities in lieu of taxes, they would be able to do this.

Mr. COLMER. Yes, but they have to have special authority of law to do this.

Mr. MacKINNON. This will give them the authority of law.

Mr. KEEFE. This is the authority of law. We are giving it now.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman will permit, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: Would you not have the very impractical situation there of the Federal Works Agency making certain allocations of funds that belong to the Housing Agency, and the Federal Works Agency telling the Housing Agency to give them so much of their money? They could say "no." So it would be a perfectly innocuous thing to do. It just would not work. You gentlemen would take the hides off them if they could manipulate money around in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment simply because we have not had time to consider the implications of the amendment. If it is practical to do that, fine, but I am afraid we are rushing into something here at the last minute with only 2 or 3 minutes to consider it, and we do not know what we are doing. I do not know whether it is practical or not. It seems to me that we may run into considerable administrative difficulty. We do know that the Federal Works Agency is in a position to administer this act, because I just talked with them a moment ago about it, but if we adopt this amendment we may run into all kinds of difficulties of administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, who has labored so faithfully for this legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The purpose of this amendment is so meritorious that I am hopeful that if there is some little technicality in the language it can be worked out when the bill goes to the other body. It seems to me we are in a much better position if this money can be taken out of the rent money in assuring these schools that they will have the money.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say to my friend, who has the same objective as I,

let us not adopt this amendment now, let us try to work it out. Then by the time it gets to the other body, if it is a good thing, let them put it in.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. In either event, it is coming out of the taxpayers' pocket. It is just as broad as it is long.

Mr. COLMER. As the gentleman from Ohio well points out, in either event it all comes from the same source, so why complicate it?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MacKINNON) there were—ayes 27, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3682) to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments, pursuant to House Resolution 279, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If no member of the minority wishes to offer a motion to recommit, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. GWINN of New York; Mr. GWINN moves to recommit H. R. 3682 to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

READING, PA.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 218, providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas 200 years ago, in 1748, the city of Reading, the county seat of Berks County of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was founded by Thomas and Richard Penn, sons of William Penn; and

Whereas it was decided jointly with Berks County, Pa., to fittingly mark the occasion by an appropriate bicentennial celebration from spring until fall 1948; and

Whereas the first defenders of the Colonies from beyond New England to reinforce General Washington's troops in Cambridge, Mass., at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War were an armed company from Reading and Berks County; and

Whereas during the period of the Revolution, Reading was a depot of military supplies, manufacturing cannon and munitions for the Continental Army, and was the site of the camp wherein were detained the Hessian prisoners captured at the Battle of Trenton; and

Whereas the first armed troops to enter the city of Washington in answer to the call of President Lincoln in 1861 for 75,000 volunteers were from the city of Reading, Pa., thus again earning and perpetuating for their city the proud title of "First Defenders"; and

Whereas Reading and Berks County through the two centuries of their existence have in addition furnished many outstanding leaders of our Nation and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas Reading and Berks County have prominently contributed to the industrial life of the United States from the establishment of the first forges and iron foundries in the early eighteenth century to the present time, and today form a great industrial center, among the Nation's leaders in many types of goods and wares; and

Whereas Berks County, of which Reading is the county seat, ranks fourth in Pennsylvania and thirty-eighth in the United States in agricultural production value; and

Whereas it is an important cosmopolitan center of the United States wherein the population represents a fusion and assimilation of the strains and heritage of almost all the nations of Europe in the best tradition of American life and spirit; and

Whereas it is recognized that, while the contribution of the city of Reading and county of Berks to the material and physical welfare of the Nation has been large, the greatest contribution to the forwarding of the Nation has been their considered and collective judgment, their thoughtful patriotism so that in every crisis in national affairs

they have thought their way through to a solution which has reflected the Nation's thinking and which has enabled them in good conscience to make rich contribution of lives and fortunes in every national emergency of war or peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Government and people of the United States unite with the city of Reading, Pa., in a fitting and appropriate observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of its founding.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States-Reading Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") to be composed of nine Commissioners, as follows: One person to be appointed by the President of the United States as his representative, the President pro tempore of the Senate and two Members of the Senate to be appointed by said President pro tempore, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and four Members of the House to be appointed by said Speaker.

SEC. 3. The Commission, on behalf of the United States, shall cooperate with the representatives of the city of Reading in proper and appropriate activities commemorating such anniversary.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 5. Any vacancies occurring in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments to such Commission are made.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 2455 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1368) to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., sec. 1171), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "seven hundred and sixty" and inserting in their place the words "one thousand five hundred and twenty". The said section is further amended by striking out the words "one hundred and sixty" in the second proviso and inserting in their place the words "seven hundred and sixty."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have consulted with the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and both are agreeable to the present consideration of the bill.

It is identical to House bill H. R. 3971 which was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. The Department of the Interior reported the bill favorably.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3871) was laid on the table.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4308) to amend section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of belligerent nations, neutral nations, or other American Republics.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942, as amended (title 10, U. S. C., sec. 1423a), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States and former officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States holding any office of profit or trust under the United States be, and they are hereby, authorized, during the present war and for a year thereafter, to accept from the governments of belligerent nations, neutral nations, or the other American Republics such decorations, orders, medals, and emblems as may be tendered them, and which are conferred by such government upon members of their own military forces, hereby expressly granting the consent of Congress required for this purpose by clause 8 of section 9, article I, of the Constitution: *Provided,* That any such officer or enlisted man or any such former officer or former enlisted man holding any office of profit or trust under the United States is hereby authorized to wear any decoration, order, medal, or emblem accepted pursuant to authority contained in this act, or heretofore accepted by such persons from the government of a belligerent nation, neutral nation, or of an American Republic."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN TO REPRESENT CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS BEFORE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3546) to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain exservice organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill provide?

Mr. MITCHELL. This bill has been discussed with the leadership on both sides of the House and has been accepted by both sides.

Mr. SABATH. What does it aim to do?

Mr. MITCHELL. The bill provides that officers and enlisted men in the military service, who are retired, who are members of certain recognized veterans organizations, may present the claims of veterans to the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The presentation or prosecution of a claim under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration by an officer or enlisted man retired from the military or naval forces of the United States as a recognized representative of an organization specified in or approved under this section shall not be deemed a violation of the provision of Eighteenth United States Code, sections 198, 203; Fifth United States Code, section 99, or any other law."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all of line 6 and the remainder of the bill, and insert:

"Retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, while not on active duty, shall not by reason of their status as such be subject to the provisions of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203) and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) in the presentation of claims under statutes administered by the Veterans' Administration as accredited representatives of an organization specified in or recognized under this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 200 of Public Law 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, June 29, 1936, to permit recognition of officers and enlisted men retired from the military and naval forces of the United States as representatives of certain organizations in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to ex-

ceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3999, under an open rule, with 1 hour general debate.

The bill authorizes the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from the west coast evacuation of persons of Japanese ancestry, under military orders.

As I understand the measure, it simply permits the Attorney General of the United States to adjudicate the claims of those of Japanese ancestry who were hurriedly moved out of their homes, at the outbreak of the war, and to settle such claims up to \$2,500.

It is a very meritorious measure, and I do not believe it is necessary to take any further time in explaining the rule or the bill.

Mr. SABATH. The rule provides for the consideration of H. R. 3999, which I understand was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill authorizes the Attorney General to adjust the claims of persons of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from their homes in the Western States during the early part of the war under military orders.

In view that the Attorney General must determine the fair and equitable losses sustained, must substantiate the claims, and the time limitation of 18 months in which applications must be filed, I feel that this is legislation in the right direction. Further, justice requires that we adjudicate the losses of those citizens and others of Japanese origin who proved loyal during the war and who, through no action or fault of their own, were removed from their homes, which resulted in financial loss or damage to them. They should be compensated for such losses, and, with the administration of the act in the hands of the Attorney General, I am satisfied that their claims will be justly considered and the interests of the United States will be properly safeguarded. Consequently, I shall not take up any more time of the House.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Rules Committee and the bill was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee. I therefore move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3999, with Mr. VOYTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], chairman of the subcommittee which reported this bill. He is fully prepared to tell us about it.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this bill is rather a simple one. I believe I can give you the main outline of it in a very few minutes.

You will recall that shortly after Pearl Harbor an Executive order was issued requiring the evacuation of persons of Japanese descent from certain areas of the mainland, also in Hawaii. There is no disposition on the part of the committee or anyone so far as I know to question the good faith of the people who made that order. It appeared they were acting then in a patriotic spirit and exercising their best judgment on the evidence as it appeared at that time. Fortunately, their fears were groundless; there was no sabotage. On the contrary, the people involved had a higher percentage of enlistments in the armed forces than the Nation-wide average. Nevertheless, considerable damage was done to these people in their being forcibly removed from their homes and businesses, some to camps and others on farms.

This bill was recommended by President Truman and recommended by the Department of the Interior. It passed the Senate in a different form in the last Congress. It was also reported favorably last year by the House Judiciary Committee, but late in the session, and did not reach the floor of the House.

Subcommittee No. 2 had hearings on the bill this year and reported it to the full committee, and the full committee has now reported it with amendments.

The original bill provided for the setting up of a commission in the Department of the Interior. We have changed that provision in order to avoid the setting up of another commission or board and have simply turned the matter over to the Attorney General, giving him authority to settle these claims. We were moved to do that because of our belief that the Attorney General's office was equipped with the personnel familiar with this sort of thing and we believed it would be done better and with less expense than by setting up some commission.

The committee also substantially rewrote the bill. We appreciated the fact that war brings a loss to many people.

A young man, for example, who enlists or is drafted, who is running a small business and has to turn the key in the door, goes away; when he comes back he finds he has lost several years out of his life, a loss for which no compensation can ever be made.

So we have done the best we could in writing this bill to allow compensation only for those elements of damage which can be traced directly to the evacuation order. I regret we are not able to give you the exact details as to what the cost will be. The highest figure we had, incidentally, was \$10,000,000. Personally, I believe the rewriting of the bill will result in a much less amount. That is the substance of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to anyone who may have any questions in regard to this proposed legislation.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am very much in favor of this measure although the number of Japanese who were evacuated from the Territory of Hawaii were limited. I think it is eminently just and fair that this method should be devised to do those people justice. The committee is to be congratulated on the consideration it has given to this measure and the manner in which it has reported the bill.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I rise simply to compliment the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee and the Subcommittee for giving the House the opportunity to pass this bill which is grounded in honor and in justice. I feel that you have rendered a good service in submitting this bill to us because it gives us a chance to show the world for the second time that the House of Representatives of the United States believes in making our Government a government not only of law but of honor and justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I may say that the subcommittee was unanimous and had the benefit of the advice and support of the full committee and, as has been stated here, the committee was unanimous in reporting out the bill.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I, too, want to compliment the committee. In my own district and in the State of Oregon there were a large number of these citizens of Japanese origin who were just literally uprooted, taken away from their homes, their businesses, their farms, and transported to camps elsewhere out of the State. They suffered very material dam-

age, and, as the gentleman said, they were indeed loyal in most cases, particularly loyal to this country, and many of them were in the armed forces.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The facts show they made a splendid record.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in complimenting the committee on presenting this bill to us. I have received a great many letters on the subject. I have many of these people around Columbia University in my district; therefore I am very much interested, I think it is a splendid thing and is elemental justice.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the 23,000 Nisei soldiers who served in our armed forces. Of the 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry who were taken to relocation camps, a larger percentage enlisted in our armed forces than was the percentage of any other group in the United States. One of the outstanding units in the recent World War was Combat Team 442, composed of some of the finest fighting men that wore our uniform.

In considering this legislation great care was taken so there might be no imposition on the Treasury of the United States. The subcommittee believes that every safeguard has been written into the law.

As the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has stated, the original provision contemplated the creation of a new agency in the Department of the Interior.

We felt that because in the Justice Department there were units for handling alien property claims, and claims in the Court of Claims, and in the Land Division, that there was adequate machinery that could be implemented to the extent that it could take up this new work without any great difficulty. Under the language of this bill the Justice Department has authority to settle claims up to \$2,500. It has the authority to adjudicate claims in larger amounts, but where the amount is in excess of \$2,500 it is necessary to submit that claim to the appropriate committee, as are judgments that are recovered in the Court of Claims. This bill in a small way will make whole those people who were the innocent victims of an order that probably should never have been issued, and I trust that there will not be a vote against it. It is indeed significant that there was not a case of espionage or sabotage brought against persons of Japanese ancestry. They should certainly be compensated because of the losses they suffered as a direct result of the evacuation. This would be simple justice. The kind of justice everyone in our country is entitled to receive.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, the matter has been very fully and entirely adequately covered by the two distinguished gentlemen who have preceded

me, and I am not going to trespass upon the time of the House to the extent of the time allotted me except to emphasize two points which perhaps have not been stressed.

The first is that in this bill we are attempting to redress a wrong which has been suffered by these persons of Japanese ancestry by reason of an action of our Government which was entirely unique in all our history. Never before had there been a forced evacuation of this sort.

Secondly, at this particular time, when there are those seeking every effort to attack American ideologies and American principles, it seems to me that if we pass this bill we are putting ourselves in very good position to resist those attacks, because this will show to the world that when our Government by voluntary action of its own affecting a special racial group brings about a situation where these individuals suffer loss of their property, even though the act of the Government is caused by military necessity, we are ready, willing, and anxious to go forward with remedial legislation and attempt to redress those wrongs and do the right thing in the interests of simple justice.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, this act is made necessary, as has been explained, by the action of not only the War Department but this Congress, in authorizing the evacuation of those of Japanese descent from the Western Defense Command on the Pacific coast. The reason I say that Congress had a part in it is that the method by which the order was enforced was a statute passed by this Congress which provided that it is a misdemeanor to disobey any order issued by a military commander in a defense area.

Originally the President issued an Executive order authorizing the War Department or the appropriate military commander to evacuate from critical defense areas persons who were considered potentially dangerous to our national security. Congress shortly thereafter enacted the legislation to which I have referred which had the effect of ratifying the Executive order.

While I am in favor of the bill, I rise to speak solely in case there is any criticism, actual or implied, against the military commander who issued the order, who, in this case was General DeWitt, an able and efficient officer, now retired. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained the legality of the evacuation of these Japanese, because it considered there was reasonable ground for the issuance of the order, under the circumstances that were presented, after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I may say to the gentleman that no witness appeared before the subcommittee who had any criticism whatever. Speaking for myself, I certainly would have it very distinctly understood that the reporting out

of this bill involved no criticism whatever of the people who enforced this law.

Mr. GOFF. I am happy to have this statement from the gentleman from Iowa.

The reason no examination into the individual loyalty of those who were evacuated was possible was the shortage of time. There were over 100,000 of these people. The attack on Pearl Harbor had recently been made, and the military commander rightly concluded that we should not be taken by surprise again.

I have had only the briefest of time to examine it, but it seems to me this is an excellent bill. It provides a general procedure for the relief of a group who suffered special damage through military necessity. It specifically provides that no damages will be recoverable for anything except property damage. It does not authorize any fancy claims for punitive damage, humiliation, mental pain, or suffering. It places a time limit for the filing of claims. I shall support the bill, because if you do not adopt this bill, in every subsequent session of Congress you will have a long series of private bills introduced for the purpose of giving relief to some of these people who suffered as a result of the evacuation. This bill is an orderly way of doing justice to these people, most of whom were fine, loyal American citizens. I hope you will give it your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate any claim by a person of Japanese ancestry against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, when such claim is not compensated for by insurance or otherwise and is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may prescribe, for damage to or loss of real or personal property (including without limitation damage to or loss of personal property bailed to or in the custody of the Government or any agent thereof), that is a reasonable and natural consequence of the evacuation or exclusion of such person by the appropriate military commander from a military area in Arizona, California, Oregon, or Washington; or from the Territory of Alaska, or the Territory of Hawaii, under authority of Executive Order Numbered 9066, dated February 19, 1942 (3 CFR, Cum. Supp., 1092), section 67 of the act of April 30, 1900 (48 U. S. C. 532), or Executive Order Numbered 9489, dated October 18, 1944 (3 CFR, 1944 Supp., 45). As used herein "evacuation" shall include voluntary departure from a military area prior to but in anticipation of an order of exclusion therefrom. Existence or intervention of other causes affecting the damage or loss, including action or nonaction by the claimant or his representatives, shall be considered by the Attorney General in determining the amount of relief that will be fair and equitable according to the facts as they appear in each case.

LIMITATIONS; CLAIMS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED

SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General shall receive claims for a period of 18 months from the date of enactment of this act. All claims not presented within that time shall be forever barred.

(b) The Attorney General shall not consider any claim—

(1) by or on behalf of any person who after December 7, 1941, was voluntarily or involun-

tarily deported from the United States to Japan or who is otherwise resident in a foreign country;

(2) for damage or loss arising out of action taken by any Federal agency pursuant to sections 4067, 4068, 4069, and 4070 (relating to alien enemies) of the Revised Statutes, as amended (50 U. S. C. 21-24), or pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App., and Supp. 1-31, 616);

(3) for damage or loss to any property, or interest therein, vested in the United States pursuant to said Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; and

(4) for damage or loss on account of death or personal injury, personal inconvenience, physical hardship, or mental suffering.

HEARINGS; EVIDENCE; RECORDS

SEC. 3. (a) The Attorney General shall give reasonable notice to the interested parties and an opportunity for them to be heard and to present evidence before making a final determination upon any claim.

(b) Any relevant evidence having probative value shall be considered by the Attorney General in his inquiries. For the purpose of any hearing or investigation authorized under this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to examination of documentary evidence, attendance of witnesses, and production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U. S. C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Attorney General. Any person appointed to examine witnesses may be authorized by the Attorney General to issue subpoenas, to procure attendance of witnesses or production of documents, and to appoint an officer to serve the same. Subpoenas may be served personally, by registered mail, by telegraph, or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal place of business of the person required to be served. A verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of service, shall be proof of service, as shall be the return receipt or telegraph receipt when service is by registered mail or telegraph, respectively. On request the United States marshals or their deputies shall serve such process in their respective districts.

(c) A written record shall be kept of all hearings and proceedings under this act and shall be open to public inspection.

ADJUDICATIONS; PAYMENT OF AWARDS; EFFECT OF ADJUDICATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Attorney General shall dispose of all claims filed under this act by award or order of dismissal, as the case may be, upon written findings of fact and reasons for the decision. A copy of each such adjudication shall be mailed to the claimant or his attorney.

(b) The Attorney General may make payment of any award not exceeding \$2,500 in amount out of such funds as may be made available for this purpose by Congress.

(c) On the first day of each regular session of Congress the Attorney General shall transmit to Congress a full and complete statement of all adjudications rendered under this act during the previous year, stating the name of each claimant, the amount claimed, the amount awarded, the amount paid, and a brief synopsis of the facts in the case. All awards not paid under subsection (b) hereof shall be paid in like manner as are final judgments of the Court of Claims.

(d) The payment of an award shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, and shall be a full discharge of the United States and all of its officers, agents, servants, and employees with respect to all claims arising out of the same subject matter. An order of dismissal against a claimant, unless set aside by the Attorney

General, shall thereafter bar any further claim against the United States or any officer, agent, servant, or employee thereof arising out of the same subject matter.

ATTORNEYS' FEES

SEC. 5. The Attorney General, in rendering an award in favor of any claimant, may as a part of the award determine and allow reasonable attorneys' fees, which shall not exceed 10 percent of the amount allowed, to be paid out of, but not in addition to, the amount of such award.

Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with such claim any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if recovery be had, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than \$2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act the Attorney General may—

(a) appoint a clerk and such attorneys, examiners, interpreters, appraisers, and other employees as may be necessary;

(b) call upon any Federal department or agency for any information or records necessary;

(c) secure the cooperation of State and local agencies, governmental or otherwise, and reimburse such agencies for services rendered;

(d) utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed and available;

(e) assist needy claimants in the preparation and filing of claims;

(f) make such investigations as may be necessary;

(g) make expenditures for witness fees and mileage and for other administrative expenses;

(h) prescribe such rules and regulations, perform such acts not inconsistent with law, and delegate such authority as he may deem proper in carrying out the provisions of this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VORVY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3999) to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders, pursuant to House Resolution 305, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at

the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

NAVY POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 318 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 318 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 1341, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

This is an open rule providing for 1 hour general debate.

H. R. 1341 has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services. It has been amended rather strenuously and sharply, I might say, so as to reduce the original authorized appropriation from \$28,750,000 to \$2,500,000. This is just enough money to permit the Navy to take over a structure on the Monterey Peninsula, which it has been using, under a lease, for officer training.

I have personally seen this installation. I know something of it. If the Navy is to continue to pay rental under the lease until it expires, and then put the prop-

erty back in condition to turn over to the owners, it will cost the Government more money than it would go ahead with this legislation and purchase the property outright.

Therefore, it is to the benefit of the Treasury of the United States, as well as to the benefit of the Navy, to have this property under Federal ownership.

There can be no question in the minds of anyone, I believe, as to the necessity for having a permanent postgraduate school for Navy officers on the Pacific coast. Certainly, we will always have a large proportion of our Navy in the Pacific. Certainly, it is necessary in these days of modern warfare, and especially in these times when there has been so much scientific development in the different methods of warfare, for our officers of the Navy, America's first line of defense, to be trained and schooled in the use of the very latest naval equipment as it is developed. Our Navy must be kept modern, our officers trained and schooled up to the minute, if America is to remain secure. That is exactly the purpose behind the establishment of this school, and that is the reason why it is needed so badly.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. To what extent will this postgraduate school duplicate the present service schools which we have now over the country?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will not in any way duplicate the service schools we now have. Instead, it will lighten the load and will reduce the cost that the Government is incurring through its attempt to train these particular officers in private scholastic institutions. It will actually mean a saving to the Government.

Mr. SNYDER. I do not have reference to the Naval Academy, but we do have service schools, postgraduate schools, schools which both officers in the Army and Navy, who have been in the service a number of years, attend. They go there and get what we now term a "postgraduate course" in their particular branch.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The answer to that question is this: We have about 500 officers now attending the various universities of the country, receiving what we call specialized instructions. We have 500 line officers on training at Newport, R. I. We have 500 in engineering at the Naval Academy Postgraduate School. This is in addition to all that training.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I might also add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, this school will obviate the necessity of bringing naval officers from the Pacific clear across the United States and back again, in order to attend some of the schools on the east coast, which are already overcrowded and which cannot be used on a permanent basis for postgraduate training.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

NAVAL SCHOOL AT MONTEREY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during my many years of service, I have never heard a gentleman make a stronger plea for favorable consideration of a rule and a bill than the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] has made on this rule. He pointed out the need for this splendid hotel and site at Monterey, Calif. I happen to know the locality and I know of the hotel that the Navy is so much interested in obtaining for use as a postgraduate school. It is a wonderful spot and I know the Navy gentlemen are viewing it with a great deal of expectation. The splendid Delmonico Hotel and its premises enjoys a world-wide reputation and it is second to none of the other splendid spots in California. I will say that much, recalling my visit there some years ago. However, the Navy has acquired and owns thousands and thousands of acres of land in California suitable for this postgraduate school. They have expended, as I understand, close to \$150,000,000 for some of these lands, which could be utilized for this school.

I am informed by a former Member of this House, a Member of the other body who has made a thorough investigation, and I know the gentleman from Georgia knows that Member of the other body who informed me there is no need, no possible need, for acquiring this hotel and the adjacent land.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a bit of information that I think the gentleman should have before he concludes his remarks?

Mr. SABATH. I am always desirous of obtaining valuable information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very happy to inform the gentleman and the House that the body at the other end of the Capitol has passed this measure unanimously this afternoon after a short debate.

APPROACH IRRESISTIBLE

Mr. SABATH. It is very likely that the former Member could not have been present to give the Senate certain information it should have had before acting on the bill. Perhaps the gentleman was detained somewhere else and was not able to be there.

But who am I to criticize the action of the other body? I am not going to do it. We all know, however, of the courtesy that prevails in the other body and how easy it is over there to vote money to please some Member. Oh, my colleague from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has been over there; of course, I realize that, and I realize that his manner of approach and presentation to the gentlemen over there was as irresistible as it was to us in the Committee on Rules. I fear nevertheless that this bill is not genuinely necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, California has enough. I cannot yield now; and, besides, it is not in the gentleman's district because this is not in the mountainous section.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will not the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. SABATH. For one question? Yes; I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. This school will be established not very far from where the gentleman's fine 3,000-acre farm used to be in Stockton, Calif., not very far from there.

A HEAVENLY SPOT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. SABATH. Well, about 120 or 130 miles. I am familiar with that beautiful spot. I used to go there when the heat was unbearable. I used to spend some of the summer months, after we had adjourned, in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys. Whenever I could leave on Friday night or Saturday to cool off and enjoy life I would drive down there; and really, it is a heavenly place, and I do not blame the Navy officers for wanting it for themselves and their families. I do not envy them anything they are entitled to for the splendid services they rendered to the country during the last war. They are entitled to some pleasure, but "some" I say. I do not want them to spend all their time down there.

Although this is a wonderful spot, I am under the impression that the Middle West is entitled to some consideration. We have in the Middle West a beautiful lake, Lake Michigan. On that lake we have a splendid naval institution. I know it could be utilized, and we would not need to spend these \$3,200,000 to start with. The gentleman from Ohio said we were going to save money by buying the California site. I want him to know that it has been estimated in some quarters that before we get through with the necessary construction and improvements it may reach a cost amounting to \$25,000,000 to \$28,000,000. To the Members on the other side of the aisle that, of course, is small change. They have become accustomed now to appropriating and spending money right and left, and no doubt their eyesight is dim when it comes to seeing the number of digits that follow a dollar sign. But God help the country if they continue much longer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I realize that we are approaching the end of the session and that the gentleman from Illinois is so worn out from his efforts in opposing all that the Republicans have endeavored to do to reduce public spending that he has evidently been unable to find the time or the energy to read this measure.

If he had read this measure he would see that the appropriation is lessened. If he had listened to the testimony in the Rules Committee he would have known that this has been approved by the Armed Services Committee and by the Navy, that there would be no other funds appropriated for this particular item. I am sure that the gentleman has not visited this particular spot in the last 50 years at least, because he has been so zealous in his attention to his duties as a member of the Rules Committee. I am wondering when it was that the gentleman inspected this particular site.

Mr. SABATH. Well, I have not been there for inspection. I have been there

for pleasure for a couple of days at a time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How long ago, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. SABATH. It was at my own expense and it did not cost the Government anything. The last visit I made to that beautiful spot was about 16 years ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me interrupt again for a moment to say to the gentleman that no wonder this building was sold at such a low price. If the gentleman went there for pleasure that long ago I know that the building is quite antiquated.

IMPROVED BY NAVY

Mr. SABATH. But the Navy has been in control for several years and it has spent quite a large sum of money to remodel it and improve it. I hope it is all that these gentlemen hope for, but they are not ready to give positive assurance that it will not cost any more money. I heard these promises that it would not cost any more. This small amount of a few million dollars does not mean much to you, I realize that, but I know that the Government will save money by acquiring it instead of holding on to it at the present high rent that the Navy is paying.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The closing days of any Congress brings very many peculiar situations and I am rather surprised to see the gentleman from Illinois take the floor and criticize the Navy Department which is headed and controlled by his own administration. Now, I have faith in Mr. Forrestal as Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Forrestal has assured me personally that it would be much to the advantage of the Government financially to take over this property, that these funds will not be expended as the gentleman has said, but, instead, that this is in the interest of the welfare of the country. I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in disagreement with his own Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. SABATH. I again thank the gentleman for that information. Of course, I understand that the Secretary of the Navy, yielding to the demands and the recommendations of various officers of the Navy, is obliged frequently to recommend things which he does not actually approve of. But having the interest of these splendid officers at heart he wants them to have as fine a place as possible. Let me say, though, if the Secretary of the Navy were acquainted with the wonderful opportunity that presents itself at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station on Lake Michigan, close to the best city in the United States, Chicago, he would have considered Great Lakes and it would not be necessary to expend these millions of dollars. We have the land there, we have a wonderful lake there, and it could be utilized splendidly and to the same extent as this great hotel will be in Monterey, Calif.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois it should show in the Record that since the gentleman from Illinois has found his way up into northern Wisconsin it has not been necessary for him to go way out to California and find 3,000 acres in order to get cooled off because he can get cooled off up in northern Wisconsin in a much better area; he can enjoy good fishing and fully appreciate the wonderful climate of northern Wisconsin.

Mr. SABATH. I fully appreciate the wonderful climate in Wisconsin, and there being so much heat put under me, I need something like that from time to time. I need some place to cool off.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Georgia [Judge Cox], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. With all of its shaded lanes, its beautiful hills and dales, its marvelous swimming pool, its magnificent golf courses, and with all of its other finery, it is just a little bit of dreamland of which there cannot be the slightest doubt. But I am inclined to believe the gentleman agrees with me that the sponsors of this measure made out an excellent case that these conditions exist there; that Monterey is one of the most beautiful spots in the world of which we can conceive, which stimulates the ambition of the Navy to acquire it, yet in spite of that fact it was made to appear that it was good business to acquire ownership; that it will take care of the need that results from this expansion program of the Navy Department to give postgraduate training or extra training to our people in the Navy, and I know the gentleman does not oppose the granting of the rule nor the adoption of the bill.

Mr. SABATH. How can I? How can I when so many of my friends are so greatly interested to see that we should provide the finest spot that can be found, even in that great State of California? I did not finish when I called attention to the availability of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station situated on Lake Michigan. What I want to bring home is this: The vast majority of these men in the Navy today, the most enlistments, come from the Middle West, but unfortunately the Middle West is always forgotten. We being broad-minded and liberal always yield to the appeals and recommendations of the gentlemen from California or from Texas or from the South or from the East, but in return the Members representing the other sections of our country do not reciprocate when we from the Midwest advocate something for our section. I regret that the Navy gentlemen, as well as others, are not familiar with the advantages that we have in Chicago, with our beautiful parks and boulevards, which would be available and would be enjoyed by them, and to the many adjacent beauty spots comparable to any in the United States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, private enterprise of Chicago has provided for the

service of the Middle West and of the country your famous stockyards which are worth more than all of these governmental favors shown to other parts of the country.

Mr. SABATH. Yes, we are, but there are a great many other outstanding industries that supply the Nation with many of its needs and wants.

I cannot help but yield to the acting minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the frank answer of my friend from Illinois probably applies to most of us in connection with this bill. However, referring to the observation made by the brains of the Republican Party in the House, my friend from Ohio [Mr. Brown], that the gentleman was spending most or all of his time resisting the cuts in appropriations made by our Republican friends, I think the Record will show that the gentleman from Illinois has certainly spent time and fought vigorously against the false economy of our Republican friends as evidenced by the sharp cuts in appropriations for the West and the Northwest, the sharp cuts in appropriations for agriculture in violation of implied agreements, and all the cuts along the line, so that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has devoted his time this session to fighting false economy and not real reductions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. However, I did not wish to bring in politics and you know I am not accustomed to it, but I repeat, how can I, from time to time, help criticizing Republican actions that are not to the best interests of our country as I view them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there are no further requests for time on either side, as I understand. I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1361) entitled "An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. SPARKMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOW-RENT-HOUSING AND SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing

and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from committee:

JULY 23, 1947.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on House Administration, effective this date.

With good wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,

TOM PICKETT,
Member of Congress, Seventh District of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

NAVY POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL AT MONTEREY, CALIF.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1341, with Mr. CHENOWETH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time is to be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, general debate is to continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the committee this afternoon is to provide additional facilities which are urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers. In considering the security of our Nation and the need for proper training of our military officers, this is one of the most urgent bills before the Congress. The bill H. R. 1341 has been considered by the Committee on Armed Services over a period of many weeks. We have very carefully studied and examined every facility owned both by the Army and Navy in order to determine whether those facilities can be adapted readily to the needs of the so-

called postgraduate training for our naval officers.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the same conclusion that three special committees of the Congress have reached that the facilities at Monterey, Calif., which have been under lease by the Navy for several years during the war for the training of our pre-flight officers, adequately meets the needs of the Navy in this particular respect. This bill is truly an economy measure. It not only meets our requirements by providing facilities for the proper training of our naval officers, but over a period of 7 years as a result of the savings made in the transportation of officers and their dependents and household effects and providing quarters for 200 married men, we will save over \$4,000,000. The entire cost of this project, when it is fully commissioned, will be in the neighborhood of \$2,500,000. That would make a savings in the period of 7 years of about \$1,500,000.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I fully understand the position in which the gentleman finds himself today, but I am rather disturbed that this might be an entering wedge in the transfer of activities now at the Newport Training Station and that this will be a move similar to that which occurred when the work of the torpedo station at Newport was siphoned away. The gentleman will recall at the time the plant at Forest Park, Ill., was built for the purpose of manufacturing torpedoes we were given the assurance that this was just supplemental and would not take over the activities at Newport.

I understand this addition will be at a cost of \$2,500,000 instead of the \$28,000,000 requested by the Navy originally. Can the gentleman give me the assurance that this is only going to be a \$2,500,000 project and that next year or the year after the Congress will not be authorizing the Navy to spend the entire \$28,000,000 originally requested and close down the training station at Newport?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman's inquiry is a very pertinent inquiry, coming as he does from an area in which one of the most active training stations of the country is located and with which I am thoroughly familiar, Newport, R. I. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Post and Stations of the House Committee on Armed Services, I may say that matter has been given very thorough consideration by the committee. I cannot visualize the establishment of a brand-new, up-to-date, large postgraduate school at any other place in this country as long as we have the facilities presently available that will meet the requirements of this Nation in the emergency period that lies ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

It is only because of that viewpoint that instead of adopting the program of a brand-new school that we should establish a school that would meet the emergency required by the Navy until we can find out what the international situation will be 5 or 10 years hence. For that reason, I am firmly of the opinion that we ought to maintain the postgraduate school at Newport to train 500 men now there, 500 men at Annapolis, where we are training men in engineering and other scientific subjects, and also to carry on the training at the various universities in the field of supplies, public works, and specialized subjects of that nature, another 500 men, making a total in those three activities of 1,500 officers. It is imperative that we add 500 more officers to that list in order that we may take care of the backlog of 10,000 Reserve officers who have limited training in which we might call line activities over and above the experience they have had in the Navy. It is to take care of them particularly, as well as the graduates of the Naval Academy and the NROTC, in order to meet these emergency requirements that we are reporting this bill calling for the expenditure not of \$28,000,000 requested originally for a new, modern institution, but a bill which will acquire the property which we are now leasing, at an estimated cost of about \$2,149,000. The difference between that and \$2,500,000 in the bill is for fully commissioning the Monterey property in order to meet the requirements I spoke about.

We ought not to extend this plant until it can be shown there is absolute necessity for the establishment of a brand new postgraduate school anywhere else in the country.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. I think the argument advanced a few moments ago that we were saving money by not transporting officers from the Pacific coast to the East coast, or vice versa, is a sound one. I have no objection to a school being established in California to take care of that group that would have to be transferred, but I do want to be assured that in so doing it will not mean that Newport will eventually be eliminated.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I said a moment ago, we have a fleet today that is many, many times stronger, larger, and more powerful than it was in the prewar days. We have a Navy today of approximately 400,000, whereas before the war it was only about 150,000 men. But as we enter the field of atomic energy, electronics, guided missiles, jet propulsion, and all of the latest developments we have made in the field of research, we must find the means by which we can train these officers from the fleet, and all the graduates of our various schools, in the latest advancement which we are making in the field of modern warfare. To save money for the Government of the United States we think it is the part of wisdom to establish this school on the west coast and to meet our requirements in other respects, to save transportation of the officers and their families from the Pacific all across the

country to Newport or Annapolis, and all the way back, to save the transportation of their household goods. And, in these quarters, these facilities that we are here recommending be purchased today there will be provided quarters for 200 families with a considerable savings in quarters allowance to the Government. Over a period of 7 years the savings will amount to approximately \$4,000,000, or in other words, in 7 years a net saving of a million and a half over what it will cost to acquire the property. From the standpoint therefore of meeting the emergency need of training the naval officers and from the standpoint of economy we believe this to be a very sound project for the Government to adopt.

This bill, as amended by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to acquire six parcels of land, consisting of 606 acres, at Monterey, Calif., and to establish there a naval postgraduate school. The Navy now holds an option for the purchase of this land and the buildings thereon, at a price of \$2,149,800. The existing improvements consist of a large modern hotel building and adjacent cottages. The property has been under lease by the Navy for several years, during which time it has been used successively as a preflight training school and later for the technical training of certain enlisted ratings. The facilities now available there will be adequate, with minor alterations, to provide all the requirements necessary for the immediate establishment of a general line school with a capacity of between 500 and 600 student officers. The bill provides that the total cost of the project, including the acquisition of the property and fully commissioning the school shall not exceed \$2,500,000. The difference between the total cost and the purchase price, as I said before, represents the cost of commissioning the activity, the cost of necessary alterations and the cost of architectural and engineering services.

In order to meet its obligations based upon commitments to those Reserve officers who have transferred to the Regular Navy, the Navy must provide these officers the necessary opportunities for professional training which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with graduates of the Naval Academy. The general line course, consisting of a comprehensive review of general professional subjects, such as gunnery, seamanship, administration and command, is designed to satisfy this need. It is planned, accordingly, to give all junior line officers this training. The importance of giving this training to all former Reserve officers has been amply demonstrated by the experience gained with a pilot group of Reserves who received general line training at Annapolis in 1945. It was found that these officers were deficient in professional knowledge and education, particularly in mathematics. Moreover, while they were found to be highly proficient in the particular department or work in which they had been engaged during their wartime service, they lacked the broad general knowledge required of a line officer.

Existing facilities for naval postgraduate training are not adequate to meet the needs outlined above. Neither are they capable of expansion to take care of an additional enrollment. The postgraduate school at Annapolis, which included general line training as well as advanced technical and engineering courses prior to the war, is now devoted exclusively to the latter type of instruction. All general line training is now given at the general line school in Newport, R. I. The capacity of each of the above schools is between 500 and 600 students. In addition, about 500 officers are receiving advanced training at civilian universities, making an over-all total of about 1,500 to 1,700 students in the postgraduate program.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is there no opposition to this program?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know. The committee unanimously approved this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill really only implements the present laws providing for the commissioning of a large number of ROTC graduates in the line of the Navy in that it provides needed facilities for the completion of their education as line officers.

Present legislation recognizes the fairness, as well as the need, of providing means whereby these graduates of ROTC's shall have an opportunity to be integrated into the naval service on an equality with graduates of the United States Naval Academy, but existing facilities are inadequate for the purpose.

In this bill we provide for the establishment of a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., a location ideally adapted in climate, location, and in accessibility by ships of the fleet. There is little question but that the proposed school should go to the Pacific coast as a means of saving considerable money in transportation costs due to the normally heavy concentration of naval vessels on that coast. There is no question regarding the adequacy of the site proposed, of the present hotel structure thereon, or of the ultimate benefits—both financial and professional—which will accrue to the Navy through the passage of this enabling legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this proposed United States Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, Calif., will be authorized without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to extend the debate on this subject and I am not speaking for the purpose of opposing the bill. I think it is a very worthy extension of the postgraduate training of naval officers for the Navy, and I think the appropriation authorized in the bill for the purchase of the property is very reasonable. The reason I am saying anything about the matter at all is that this bill does not

add to the undergraduate training of officer personnel for the Navy. There is a desperate need at present for an undergraduate school on the Pacific coast in addition to the one at Annapolis. I know the custom and tradition and the opposition to extending the undergraduate school beyond Annapolis, but we all know that Annapolis is limited insofar as expansion is concerned, and that something will have to be done to provide additional naval training facilities soon.

There is not a better place in the United States for training undergraduate naval officers than on the Pacific coast, and I mean particularly in southern California, because of the year-around fine climate and the facilities for extensive training on land, sea, under-seas, and in the air. I have introduced bills on two occasions to accomplish that purpose and I trust that the Committee on the Armed Services when it comes to the consideration of these bills will give them serious consideration in the interest of providing additional officer personnel for the naval forces which is limited insofar as the facilities at Annapolis are concerned, eventually we will have to have another undergraduate naval officers' school and it should be on the Pacific coast.

I hope the pending bill will pass because I believe it is very necessary, but I am also taking this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that we do need additional facilities. I hope the time will come when we will have them.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. Has the gentleman thought of the large expansion of the regular civilian universities on the west coast due to the ROTC which provides a way for young men in the Western States to get their commissions in the line of the Navy?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; I am familiar with it but I do not think that is adequate to indoctrinate the naval officers; it cannot take the place of a naval academy.

Mr. BRADLEY. One of the purposes of this school is to indoctrinate those young men after they have been a year or so at sea and to make them into well-rounded and competent naval officers. It will permit young men from all parts of the Western States who have been commissioned in the Navy through ROTC, at our colleges, rather than through the Naval Academy, to get onto a professional equality with Academy graduates. That is the reason I am so much in favor of it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the war taught us anything it taught us the need of scientific training and special training for our Army and our Navy. The bill that we have before us follows this line of thought.

In the committee I approached this bill with an open mind. In fact, at first I felt rather hesitant about the need for additional training and the request of the Navy for additional facilities for this purpose, but as the Navy unfolded its case at the hearings I became convinced

that there is a need for a postgraduate school in the Navy Department. After the officers leave the Naval Academy at Annapolis there comes a time in the life of every officer, and to a large extent in the lives of the enlisted men also in the Navy, when additional training and additional schooling is necessary if we are to maintain our Navy on the high standard that we expect to be needed in the future. These officers should be sent to postgraduate schools, perhaps several years after they have left their studies in the Academy. They should be sent there at a time when they have obtained practical experience in the operations of the Navy and when that practical experience will be of great help to them in their further schooling. It was with that idea in mind that the Navy asked the committee for this bill to authorize the construction and operation of a school at Monterey, Calif.

After the bill was considered and before the final vote, as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts will recall, I asked the committee to pause and again canvass the possibility of using some completed sites presently owned by the Government in this country that might be suitable for that purpose. At that time we called in Navy officers and we went over the whole program again. We consulted other Members of Congress. We found after mature consideration, in addition to the consideration that had been given before, that no other suggested site was entirely satisfactory, and that this bill should be approved by the Armed Service Committee and presented to the House for consideration.

I think it is important that the bill be passed. The Navy feels that its program of education is going to be retarded unless we give it this authority. As to where the school may be located, the request of the Navy should be given high consideration in our councils here today. From the testimony we had in the committee it is apparent the Navy is convinced that it is the place it needs. The amount that we allow in the bill is, of course, a great reduction from the \$28,000,000 originally placed in the bill. The amount is reduced to \$2,500,000 which the Navy thinks will be adequate and ample for the purpose, for the time being at least.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this bill ought to be passed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1341, as amended by the Committee on Armed Services, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to acquire six parcels of land consisting of approximately 606 acres at Monterey, Calif., and to establish there a naval postgraduate school. The land and buildings referred to in this bill are available to the Navy Department at an option price of \$2,149,900. The option will expire on July 31, 1947. It is known that a 30-day extension may be acquired but the present owners have definitely stated that a longer-term extension of the option will not be acceptable. The amended bill provides for alterations to existing buildings to provide school

facilities, quarters, and collateral facilities and equipment, including the acquisition of the necessary land and buildings thereon at a cost not to exceed \$2,500,000. The amount authorized will permit the acquisition of the property and make necessary alterations to accommodate a general line school for approximately 500 student officers on or about January 1, 1948.

The acquisition of the land and facilities thereon provided in this bill will provide additional capacity urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers. To meet its obligations based upon commitments to Reserve officers who have transferred to the Regular Navy, the Navy must provide these officers the necessary opportunities for professional instruction and training which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with graduates of the Naval Academy. It has been determined that former Reserve officers now in the Regular Navy actually need the additional instruction in professional subjects such as gunnery, seamanship, naval engineering, administration, and command, and the general line course is designed to fit this need.

At the present time there is a backlog of approximately 10,000 Reserve transferees who should take this course. In addition, all junior line officers will take this course. This includes Naval Academy graduates as well as graduates of the 52 Naval Reserve units throughout the country. It is estimated that an over-all capacity of 1,220 for this purpose should be provided at the earliest possible moment. At the present time, the only facilities available are those at Newport which has a capacity for approximately 600 student officers. It is expected that the Monterey site in its present form will provide capacity for at least 500 additional officers.

Existing facilities for Naval Postgraduate School are not adequate to meet the present and future needs. Neither are they capable of expansion to provide for additional enrollment. The postgraduate school at Annapolis, which included general line instruction as well as advanced technical and engineering courses prior to the war, is now devoted almost exclusively to the latter type of instruction. The situation at Annapolis was observed and commented upon by the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1947 in their report dated April 24, 1947, as follows:

The Board is of the opinion that the facilities of the Naval Postgraduate School are inadequate to meet the needs of the Navy for technically educated officers. The increased number of officers and men, and the increased amount and complexity of technical equipment now in use in the Navy, has necessitated doubling the number of student officers being educated at the present time in that school. There is insufficient laboratory space and equipment and much of the equipment on hand is out of date. The Board, therefore, recommends that immediate steps be taken to coordinate the activities and facilities of the Naval Postgraduate School so that it can be developed to serve its objectives.

The Monterey site has been determined by the Navy Department to be the most ideally suited location for a permanent postgraduate school. It fulfills all

the requisites stated as essential by the Navy Department. Three different subcommittees of the House and Senate have reached a similar finding. A subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, visited the proposed site at Monterey, Calif., in May 1946, and in their Report No. 283 recommended unanimously "that the Naval Postgraduate School be established at Monterey, Calif., in accordance with the request of the Navy Department." A subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, Seventy-ninth Congress, visited and inspected possible locations for the Naval Postgraduate School on the west coast of the continent during September 1946. This subcommittee visited eight different general areas from San Diego to Puget Sound and inspected available sites in each locality. The subcommittee in its report of April 3, 1947, to the Senate Armed Services Committee recommended:

(a) that the Naval Postgraduate School be established at Monterey, Calif., in accordance with the request of the Navy Department, (b) that the Navy Department be authorized and directed to exercise the option it holds from the Del Monte Property Co. and consummate purchase of the property mentioned in the body of this report, (c) that the Navy Department be further directed to enter negotiations with the city of Monterey to acquire for control of the operation and maintenance of the Monterey Municipal Airport with compatible arrangements for its continued use by commercial airlines, (d) that the Navy Department accept the offer of Mr. Morse of the Del Monte Property Co. to deed Del Monte golf course in fee simple to the Government, (e) in case Del Monte should not become available for any reason it is the recommendation of the committee that the other sites investigated by the committee be reassigned and reevaluated.

A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee held hearings on this bill commencing March 3, 1947, and made an exhaustive study of all requirements and possible locations for the proposed permanent Naval Postgraduate School. This subcommittee considered in detail all properties occupied by the Armed Services at the present time including surplus property and property in active use. It considered locations on the east and Gulf coasts as well as on the west coast. On April 23, 1947, the subcommittee acted on the proposed bill as amended and the chairman declared that the subcommittee approved the amended bill. Subsequently the full committee of House Armed Services Committee received the report of the subcommittee and unanimously recommended that the bill be reported favorably to the House of Representatives.

In connection with the consideration of this property, and the comparison with other possible sites on the west coast, it should be recognized that this one was not considered as an important strategic point at which important airfields or other essential operational activities were established during the war. It was leased by the Navy Department for training purposes. This observation is made to emphasize the fact that the site selected should not be one which had been used for operational purposes dur-

ing the war. It should be one which would not subject the postgraduate school to possible displacement during a future emergency. This is essential because the postgraduate school is of a permanent character and its uninterrupted continuance during times of emergency would become increasing important.

In view of these facts and the careful and extended consideration which has been given this matter by the Congress, I strongly urge the passage of the bill as recommended by the Armed Services Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the construction of a naval postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., including the necessary school facilities, quarters, and collateral facilities and equipment, including the acquisition of the necessary land, at a cost not to exceed \$28,750,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into without regard to the provisions of 3709 Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 591), as amended, shall be applicable to all public works and public utilities authorized by this act: *Provided*, That the fixed fee to be paid the contractor as a result of any contract entered into under the authority contained herein shall not exceed 6 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the construction of" and insert "to acquire six hundred and six and five hundred and ninety-two one-thousandths acres of land upon which the United States of America now has an option with buildings thereon at Monterey, Calif., for the establishment of."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "at Monterey, Calif."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "necessary", insert "construction and alterations to provide."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$28,750,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Page 2, line 6, strike out section 2.

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 3.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the spelling of the word "necessary" on page 2, line 2, of the reported bill.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CHENOWETH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1341) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., pursuant to House Resolution 318, he reported the bill back to the House with

sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AND THE SECRETARY OF WAR TO SUPPLY UTILITIES AND RELATED SERVICES TO WELFARE ACTIVITIES

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3055, An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 5. The authority granted in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this act shall terminate at midnight on December 31, 1952."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINERAL LEASING ACT FOR ACQUIRED LANDS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have consulted with the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] and with the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN], and they are both agreeable to the consideration of the bill at this time. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Public Lands and has a favorable report from the Department of the Interior. A similar though not identical bill has been passed by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands."

SEC. 2. As used in this act "United States" includes Alaska. "Acquired lands" or "lands acquired by the United States" include all lands heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States to which the "mineral leasing laws" have not been extended, including such lands acquired under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 16 U. S. C., sec. 552). "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior. "Mineral leasing laws" shall mean the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 48 U. S. C., sec. 432); the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, U. S. C., sec. 181); the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301, 30 U. S. C., sec. 271); the act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057, 30 U. S. C., sec. 281), and all acts heretofore or hereafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing acts.

SEC. 3. Except where lands have been acquired by the United States for the development of the mineral deposits, all deposits of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, sodium, potassium, and sulfur which are owned or may hereafter be acquired by the United States and which are within the lands acquired by the United States, exclusive of such deposits in such acquired lands as are situated within incorporated cities, towns, and villages, national parks or monuments, or set apart for military or naval purposes, may be disposed of by the Secretary under the provisions of the mineral-leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof. The provisions of the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301), as heretofore or hereafter amended, shall apply to deposits of sulfur covered by this act wherever situated. No mineral deposit covered by this section shall be leased except with the consent of the head of the executive department, independent establishment, or instrumentality having jurisdiction over the lands containing such deposit, or holding a mortgage or deed of trust secured by such lands which is unsatisfied of record, and subject to such conditions as that official may prescribe to insure the adequate utilization of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been acquired or are being administered: *Provided further*, That minerals in lands set apart for Indian use, including lands the jurisdiction of which has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for Indian use, shall be subject to the act entitled "An act to regulate the leasing of certain Indian lands for mining purposes," approved May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347; 25 U. S. C., secs. 396a, 396f).

SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed or construed to (a) amend, modify, or change any existing law authorizing or requiring the sale of acquired lands, or (b) empower any commission, bureau, or agency of the Government to make a reservation of the minerals in the sale of any acquired land: *Provided*, That any such sale or conveyance of lands shall be made by the agency having jurisdiction thereof, subject to any lease theretofore made, covering the mineral deposits underlying such lands.

SEC. 5. Where the United States does not own all of the mineral deposits under any lands sought to be leased and which are affected by this act, the Secretary is authorized to lease the interest of the United States in any such mineral deposits when, in the judgment of the Secretary, the public interest will be best served thereby; subject, however, to the provisions of section 3 hereof. Where the United States does not own any interest or owns less than a full interest in the minerals that may be produced from any lands sought to be leased, and which are or will be affected by this act and where, under the provisions of its acquisition, the United States is to acquire all or any part of such mineral deposits in the

future, the Secretary may lease any interest of the United States then owned or to be acquired in the future in the same manner as provided in the preceding sentence.

SEC. 6. All receipts derived from leases issued under the authority of this act shall be paid into the same funds or accounts in the Treasury and shall be distributed in the same manner as prescribed for other receipts from the lands affected by the lease, the intention of this provision being that this act shall not affect the distribution of receipts pursuant to legislation applicable to such lands: *Provided, however*, That receipts from leases or permits for minerals in lands set apart for Indian use, including lands the jurisdiction of which has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for Indian use, shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560, 25 U. S. C., sec. 155).

SEC. 7. Upon request by the Secretary, the heads of all executive departments, independent establishments, or instrumentalities having jurisdiction over any of the lands referred to in section 2 of this act shall furnish to the Secretary the legal description of all of such lands, shall furnish to him all pertinent abstracts, title papers, and other documents in the possession of such agencies concerning the status of the title of the United States to the mineral deposits that may be found in such lands.

Abstracts, title papers, and other documents furnished to the Secretary under this section shall be recorded promptly in the Bureau of Land Management in such form as the Secretary shall deem adequate for their preservation and use in the administration of this act, whereupon the originals shall be returned promptly to the agency from which they were received. Duly authenticated copies of any such abstracts, title papers, or other documents may, however, be furnished to the Secretary, in lieu of the originals, in the discretion of the agency concerned.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the rights of the State or other local authorities to exercise any right which they may have with respect to properties covered by leases issued under this act, including the right to levy and collect taxes upon improvements, output of mines, or other rights, property, or assets of any lessee of the United States.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall affect any rights acquired by any lessee of lands subject to this act under the law as it existed prior to the effective date of this act, and such rights shall be governed by the law in effect at the time of its acquisition; but any person qualified to hold a lease who on March 1, 1947, had pending an application for lease of any lands, not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands under the provisions hereof. Any person holding a lease on lands subject hereto, which lease was issued prior to the effective date of this act, shall be entitled to exchange such lease for a new lease issued under the provisions of this act, at any time prior to the expiration of such existing lease.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act, which rules and regulations shall be the same as those prescribed under the mineral leasing laws to the extent that they are applicable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after "acts," insert "Lease" includes 'prospecting permit' unless the context otherwise requires."

Page 2, line 16, after "deposits," insert "by foreclosure or otherwise for resale, or reported as surplus pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of October 3,

1944 (50 U. S. C., sec. 1611 and the following)."

Page 2, line 25, strike out "disposed of by the Secretary under the provisions of the mineral leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof" and insert "leased by the Secretary under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the mineral leasing laws, subject to the provisions hereof."

Page 3, line 17, after "administered", strike out the remainder of line 17 and all down to and including line 23.

Page 5, line 9, after "shall be", strike out "disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560, 25 U. S. C., sec. 155)" and insert "deposited in a special fund in the Treasury until final disposition thereof by the Congress."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "shall furnish to him" and insert "and."

Page 6, line 18, strike out "its" and insert "their."

Page 6, strike out lines 19 to 23 ending with the word "hereof" and insert "who, on the date of this act, had pending an application for an oil and gas lease for any lands which on the date the application was filed was not situated within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, shall have a preference right over others to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

MR. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hobbs: On page 3, line 17, after the word "administered", insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That nothing in this act is intended, or shall be construed, to apply to or in any manner affect any mineral rights, exploration permits, leases or conveyances or minerals that are or may be in any tide-lands; or submerged lands; or in lands underlying the 3-mile zone or belt involved in the case of the United States of America against the State of California now pending on application for rehearing in the Supreme Court of the United States; or in lands underlying such 3-mile zone or belt, or the continental shelf, adjacent or littoral to any part of the land within the jurisdiction of the United States of America."

MR. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hobbs: On page 4, line 7, strike out the period and insert a colon in lieu thereof and the following: "Provided further, That nothing in this act is intended, or shall be construed to affect in any manner any provision of the act of June 30, 1938 (32 Stat. 1252), amending the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813)."

MR. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Barrett:

On page 2, line 22, strike out the comma after the words "United States" and insert in lieu thereof "(".
On page 2, line 23, immediately following the word "are", insert "(a)."

On page 2, line 24, strike out "or" at the end of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof "(b)."

On page 2, line 25, immediately following the word "purposes", insert the following: "or (c) tidelands or submerged lands)."

On page 6, line 24, immediately following the word "lands", insert the following: "subject of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHICK GENERAL HOSPITAL AT CLINTON, IOWA

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and now yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 271 makes in order consideration under an open rule with an hour of general debate, House Concurrent Resolution No. 54. This concurrent resolution is to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall use the existing facilities owned by the United States Government known as Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, one of the finest and most modern hospitals in all America.

I think the enactment of this resolution will probably result in a considerable saving to the Government. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the resolution providing for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54. I only want to say that what is being provided in this bill should have been done with a great many other hospitals that the War Department has built and which they do not need at present. I do not know why these hospitals should not be utilized to the purposes for which they are greatly needed in caring for our disabled and sick veterans who served our country so well and who now require hospitalization.

I hope the passage of this bill will be an incentive and an encouragement to the War Department to turn over to the Veterans' Administration these hospitals which are not being operated but which could be utilized to good advantage. The only excuse the Veterans'

Administration gives from time to time is that the hospitals are far removed from available medical centers. I think that the personnel shortage could easily be remedied, and physicians and nurses could be found ready and willing to serve in these hospitals to take care of these deserving veterans.

I hope the Veterans' Administration will take notice of our action and will follow soon in utilizing abandoned Army and Navy hospitals in many other localities where available, without the necessity of spending millions of dollars for the construction of new hospitals which will take from 2 to 3 years to erect and equip.

Our deserving veterans are entitled to hospitalization and, while I am aware of the lack of hospital facilities in many sections of the country, the situation will be greatly relieved if the abandoned Army and Navy hospitals are utilized wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman have any other requests for time?

Mr. SABATH. No. I wish to expedite matters.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 54, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Mississippi will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there should be absolutely no objection to this resolution. The able and distinguished gentleman from New York, General KEARNEY, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, has unanimously reported this resolution, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I believe that it will be the judgment of the Congress that Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, be occupied and used by the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans. It is to be used for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent or domiciliary cases.

This will fill a very great need for veterans all over the country, Mr. Chairman. It will in no way affect the construction of another hospital in Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 54. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for his persistence in keeping before the Members of the House the need for utilization by the Veterans' Administration of the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa. He has done a magnificent job. I know that his action results from his desire to see that the veterans of the Central West are provided with proper hospital care without further delay. We as Members of Congress have a responsibility to discharge. We have accorded certain privileges to veterans and we should provide hospital facilities, particularly when those facilities are available and standing idle.

I appeared before the subcommittee, before the full committee, and before the Rules Committee to advocate bringing out this resolution. The veterans' hospitals in Chicago are overcrowded and there is a long waiting list. Estimates have been made as to how many people are waiting. Such estimates are meaningless because a large number of veterans entitled to hospitalization have given up and do not apply, because they know that the facilities are not available. By utilizing the Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, the congestion at Chicago and other points would be greatly relieved, as Clinton is only about 120 miles from Chicago. It will serve a large area in the Central West.

In the hearings, it was stated that the Schick General Hospital does not comply with the specifications of the Veterans' Administration, and yet a number of other Army hospitals whose specifications are identical with those at Schick have been accepted by the Veterans' Administration. With regard to specifications, as you may know, I have been identified with the construction industry for many years. When this point was brought up, I wondered if I was making a mistake and therefore conferred with a leading Chicago architect who has done a great deal of work for the Veterans' Administration. He told me that the Veterans' Administration's specifications are arbitrary and peculiar and that, in his judgment, the most modern private hospital in the city of Chicago would not conform to the Veterans' Administration specifications. In these times, when building materials are in short supply and building mechanics in great demand, the Veterans' Administration insists upon building new buildings to their own specifications instead of utilizing Army hospitals already built, which are comparatively new, having been built within the past 5 or 6 years. Under this procedure, these new hospital buildings would be sold for a song. They contend that veterans' hospitals should be built near important medical centers, and yet they are proposing to build hospitals in isolated locations. As I have said, Clinton is only about 120 miles from Chicago, one of the most important medical centers in the world. With air travel, getting the specialists in any branch of the medical profession to Clinton would be simply a matter of hours.

There are a number of fine Army hospitals standing empty now, and boarded

up. During the emergency which exists, these hospitals should be used, at least until new hospitals can be provided. I certainly hope the House of Representatives will act favorably on House Concurrent Resolution 54 and put itself on record with the Veterans' Administration as favoring the reopening of the Schick General Hospital in Clinton, Iowa.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Can the gentleman tell us the cost per bed of building new hospitals as per Veterans' Administration specifications?

Mr. TWYMAN. I am not prepared to do so, but I can get those figures for the gentleman. Those figures are very high, as the gentleman must know.

Mr. BUCK. I wanted to get a comparison from the gentleman between the cost per bed in veterans' hospitals and the cost per bed in these modern hospitals such as the one in Chicago about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. TWYMAN. I have those figures and will furnish the gentleman with them. I think they will be very interesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose this resolution. However, one of the few things I know a little about is hospitals. It has been my good fortune to visit a great many of the veterans' hospitals throughout the northeastern section of the United States and I know that it takes more than sticks and stones to make a hospital.

It is true this is a fine, large plant up there in Clinton, Iowa. It has a swimming pool, a recreation field, and a lot of other things; but that does not make a hospital. You cannot just reach out somewhere and staff a building with doctors and nurses, technicians, and all the other necessary requirements. The Veterans' Administration is planning to construct a new hospital in Iowa City just a few miles away from this hospital. The present Schick Hospital is of temporary construction. It is only semifireproof. General Bradley and General Hawley have been opposed to this. Here we have General Bradley heading the Veterans' Administration and I feel that he is doing a fine job. If we are going to come in here and try to legislate piecemeal and try to tell the Veterans' Administration where they can build this hospital and that hospital there is never going to be an end to it. I say we should back up General Bradley who has the responsibility of following through.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUBER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it not true that under present circumstances it will take from 3 to 5 years to complete this hospital at Iowa City, 8 miles away from Clinton?

Mr. HUBER. It may.

Mr. MITCHELL. A subcommittee made a very thorough inspection tour

out there and took into consideration the availability of practicing physicians and nurses in that immediate area. It simply recommended that this Schick Hospital be used and utilized until such time as the new hospital recommended by the Veterans' Committee has been completed. When there is no longer any need for it, then it will be turned over to the State of Iowa to be used as the State may see fit to use it.

Mr. HUBER. The present policy of the Veterans' Administration is to build these hospitals close to medical centers where they can have expert medical attention for these veterans. The evidence in the hearings, as the gentleman and I know as members of the committee, is that there are available beds within a reasonable distance. If you are going to reach out up here in Iowa and start converting this hospital you will have difficulty finding technicians and everything else that is needed to staff a hospital.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the gentleman will refer to page 13 of the report of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Crow] he will see there a report from Dr. John E. Norman covering the situation with reference to the availability of doctors and nurses.

Mr. HUBER. I am entirely familiar with the report of the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Crow] and I commend that committee for its excellent job. But the fact remains that I feel there is no necessity for going out here and taking over a hospital of temporary Army type construction that is obsolete, in view of the fact that we have a building program. For instance, close to my district we have the Crile General Hospital. The only reason it was taken over was because it was already equipped and was close and convenient to the medical center in Cleveland. That hospital is to be abandoned. They are to build a new hospital in the downtown section of Cleveland to be nearer these medical specialists.

Mr. MITCHELL. What, then, does the gentleman propose to do in respect to the 3,000 veterans in that immediate area who are not now able to get into hospitals?

Mr. HUBER. The testimony I have read and furnished by the VA is that hospital beds are available in areas adjacent to that section. There are empty beds in Hines Hospital. It is not feasible to convert this hospital into a veterans' hospital. It is spread out over so many acres that it is not practicable. General Hawley has testified it will add millions to the cost to convert such hospitals. Then there is one thing you cannot get away from and that is it is semifireproof and I do not want to see any veteran housed in that type of hospital.

Mr. MITCHELL. The building is thoroughly sprinklered; it is of concrete-block construction, faced with brick, and the only part of the building that is not fireproof is the roof.

Mr. HUBER. It is not in the best interests of our veterans to house them in temporary hospitals that are not fire-

proof; and I trust this resolution will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' organizations have made a very complete survey in Illinois and state that the veterans' load there would be much larger except for this and that they are discouraged in trying to secure hospitalization. In many cases they give up. I know that is also true all over the United States. This hospital for domiciliary cases could take care of veterans of that type in a very large area until permanent construction is started and completed.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Crow], chairman of the subcommittee that made the survey of the Schick Hospital. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the subcommittee made an exhaustive inspection of conditions in that area and submitted to the House full committee a splendid and convincing report.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of being the chairman of the investigating committee that went out to Clinton, Iowa, to look over the Schick General Hospital. This is a \$12,000,000 institution. The buildings were completed on March 1, 1943. The Army occupied it until February 1946. The building does not show any wear of any kind. The walls are in excellent condition; no weather cracks or no deterioration of any kind.

In reference to this resolution, let me explain this: We do not provide that the Veterans' Administration must occupy this hospital as a veterans' hospital. The resolution merely recommends that they occupy and use it as a veterans' hospital if they are able to staff it. We know that by the action of the Budget Committee the Veterans' Administration was reduced in personnel, and there was a question raised on that. I might say that after our report was completed I received letters from the Governor of Iowa, Governor Blue, and from several other individuals in Iowa that we met while there, and they are all very well satisfied with the action that the committee took.

I believe that the House should pass this resolution at this time and at least recommend that the Veterans' Administration use this installation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What about the statement that there are sufficient beds in this area to house the veterans?

Mr. CROW. I do not believe that statement is correct from the information we received in Clinton, Iowa, and also in Iowa City. I do not have definite or authentic figures. We were told that there were 3,200 veterans awaiting hospitalization in the Iowa area.

Mr. CARROLL. I remember this bill was on the Consent Calendar and the Veterans' Administration was objecting to it. What was the reason for their objection when there is such a great shortage of beds?

Mr. CROW. The main reason that the Veterans' Administration is objecting to this resolution is that they want their hospitals near medical centers. The new policy of building veterans' hospitals is to build them in an area where there is a medical center located. In other words, Iowa City is the home of the University of Iowa.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, it would take 2 or 3 years for the construction of a new hospital.

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Since there is such a bed shortage, I wonder what they had to say about that area furnishing sufficient beds for veterans.

Mr. CROW. Well, they never admitted that there was a bed shortage, I will say that about the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CARROLL. What would be the cost of transforming the Schick Hospital to a domiciliary institution?

Mr. CROW. We have estimates from the Veterans' Administration that it would cost in the neighborhood of \$500,000; that is, if they would use the complete hospital. This hospital is laid out so that they can use one part of it or use any parts of it. As originally built, it was a 1,500-bed hospital. If they want to use 200 beds, they can, and the heating plant is so arranged that they can shut off everything else and only occupy that part of the hospital that they desire. For that reason we recommend that it be used, because it is unoccupied and nothing being done with it. We have plans now to build a \$12,000,000 hospital at Iowa City, but that will not take care of the veterans at the present time.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield while I ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. What does the testimony before the committee show about the deficiency of beds in that area for veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will answer the gentleman that I think the chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals who heard the entire testimony could answer it more completely than I can. This will take in veterans of a large area and, as the gentleman knows, there are thousands of veterans now awaiting hospitalization. This will fill a great need.

Mr. CARROLL. It is not clear to me, however, why the Veterans' Administration would be resisting this program when there is such a great need for beds. That is what I do not understand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that the Veterans' Administration is anxious to build near universities so that they can use the hospitals as training centers as, for instance, the projected hospital at Iowa City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that hospital at Iowa City will not be completed for 2 or 3 years. We have

a situation in Boston where there is a desperate need for beds. The construction of the hospital has been recommended but not a stone has been moved, not a spade of earth has been turned. That is the situation all over the country. I may say to the gentleman that this is not mandatory, it is simply the judgment of the House that this be done. I think everyone wants the veterans to have beds.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. The Governor of Iowa has recommended that this hospital be used. I presume the situation in Iowa is like that in any State, there is a shortage of institutions for the care of the feeble-minded, the insane, and others. I wonder why the State of Iowa did not take steps to take over this great facility that lies idle.

Mr. CROW. This installation was offered to the State of Iowa by the War Assets Administration, but they placed such rigid rules and regulations on the method of their taking it over that the State legislature refused to accept it. Therefore, it is still idle.

May I call your attention to the fact that this installation has excellent facilities for all types of recreation. Because of that, our committee recommended that the Veterans' Administration use this hospital as a convalescent hospital for long-term patients. They have a swimming pool there that would be a credit to any city. I believe it cost in the neighborhood of \$180,000. It was opened 2 months before the hospital closed, so the Army personnel who were in the hospital had only a little over a month's use of the swimming pool. For that reason, we recommended that the hospital be used for that purpose, that all long-term patients be sent to this hospital for convalescence.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. Lusk].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I favor this resolution because I feel that in the face of the urgent need we have to take care of literally hundreds of veterans who need hospitalization we cannot afford to wait for new hospital construction. In addition, I think we should consider the cost of building new construction when we have facilities available all over the United States. I hope this will be a precedent for Congress to follow in using the facilities we already have, rather than wait for the planning of a long-range program of beautiful construction and beautiful facilities that will delay the consideration and treatment the veterans need immediately. I appreciate the interest of General Bradley and General Hawley in this work, but I feel that perhaps there is a tendency on the part of the VA in planning a long-range program to overlook the need our men have for immediate treatment. The members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have every day literally hundreds of calls for hospitalization. If we are to pursue the policy of building entirely new hospitals before these men are treated, I think we will

have cause to regret it very seriously. I urge that you support the resolution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], the chairman of the subcommittee that made such an exhaustive study of the situation in this area and throughout the entire country.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, this committee conducted a long and exhaustive study on this subject. We had brought in to us a petition signed by over 100,000 individuals in this area, the petition being over 3 miles long.

Regardless of the attitude of the Veterans' Administration and the testimony brought forth by its officers during the hearings, it has been conclusively shown that there are approximately 3,200 veterans in that entire area that need hospitalization.

This resolution is not one which would prevent the Veterans' Administration from eventually building their hospital in Iowa City. An amendment will be offered to that effect before the Committee rises.

Within this area, in a radius of 75 miles of Clinton there are included 8 counties in the State of Iowa, 2 counties in the State of Wisconsin, and 13 counties in the State of Illinois. With the huge veteran population in this area of our country and the desperate need for hospitalization of veterans it is necessary and imperative that the Schick General Hospital be immediately opened and put into operation.

There is complete unity in the request for the reopening of this hospital by every veterans organization and auxiliaries and every individual veteran with the fullest support and encouragement of every civic group and united for the one purpose—the reopening of the hospital.

The complete cost to reopen, I have been advised, will be in the neighborhood of \$500,000. The construction of the hospital is good, stable, and better than the average, and in its present condition will adequately serve its purpose for many years. I urge the membership of the House to support this resolution which is so greatly needed in order to hospitalize the veterans in this particular area of our country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the subcommittee that made this investigation and I came to the conclusion that this resolution should be adopted. Therefore, I voted to report it out of the subcommittee and also out of the full committee.

I yield to the lady from New Mexico [Mrs. Lusk].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to point out that, after all, it is the treatment that is accorded to the veterans in the hospitals and not the facilities themselves which really get the results. If we pay more attention to the nursing service and the medical service, I think we will achieve the important results that we are all working toward.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see the wisdom of tearing down these institutions that can be used for this purpose and then going to an enormous

expense to build new ones. Therefore, I took the position in the subcommittee and also in the full committee that this resolution should be adopted and that this institution should be used to the best possible advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the resolution is adopted.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas hospital facilities used by the Veterans' Administration at the present time are inadequate to meet the needs of veterans; and

Whereas there are available for use existing facilities owned by the United States Government and known as Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa; and

Whereas these hospital facilities are suitable for use as a modern hospital and are well located for hospitalizing veterans; and

Whereas State legislatures of certain States have during the current year adopted resolutions recommending that the Veterans' Administration utilize these hospital facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States that Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, which is adapted for use in whole or in sections for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent or domiciliary cases, be equipped, occupied, and so used by the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: On page 2, following line 5, insert another paragraph as follows:

"That it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States also that the use of Schick General Hospital for the care of veterans, particularly convalescent and domiciliary cases, should not interfere with or displace the proposed construction of a permanent veterans' hospital at Iowa City in order to make use of the services of the staff of the University of Iowa Medical School."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 54, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the action just taken by the House on my resolution pertaining to Schick Hospital in Clinton, Iowa. Believe me, the wholehearted support given to this legislation is deeply appreciated. I

say that as spokesman for the more than 150,000 veterans and members of their immediate families who through individual letters have petitioned the Congress. I say that, too, as spokesman for the hundreds of thousands of other persons who have shown keen interest in this hospital and are doing their best to protect the interests of our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my warm appreciation to the delegation—Messrs. Crow, of Pennsylvania, chairman; MITCHELL, of Indiana; and TEAGUE, of Texas—that made an on-the-spot inspection of Schick Hospital at the direction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the gentleman from New York, General KEARNEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Veterans Committee; to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, chairman of the full Veterans' Committee; and indeed to every member of her committee. I further want to express my appreciation to the Committee on Rules, of which my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable LEO E. ALLEN, is chairman, for prompt and favorable action.

A grateful Nation wants to bind up the wounds of those who have borne the burdens of battle. The action just taken by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is forceful expression of the firm intent on the part of the people's representatives that our veterans shall get the care they so richly deserve.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the resolution immediately following the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 3131, an act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of one year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, having met, after full and

free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title and agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

GREGORY McMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
J. HOWARD McGRATH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This is a technical amendment to correct a clerical error. The House recedes.

Amendment to the title: This is a technical amendment to correct a clerical error. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The committee of conference have not agreed on amendment No. 2, which proposes to amend section 5 of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, by adding at the end of such section a new subsection providing that the relinquishment of any housing accommodations, other than those in hotels and apartment hotels, by the original tenant, lessee, or occupant thereof, shall not affect any subtenant of such tenant, occupant, or lessee, and no action or proceeding to recover possession of such housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against such subtenant, so long as such subtenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord may be entitled under the provisions of such act.

GREGORY McMAHON,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
OREN HARRIS,
T. G. ABERNETHY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: After line 8, insert: "Sec. 2. Section 5 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45-1605), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The relinquishment of any housing accommodations, other than those in hotels and apartment hotels, by the original tenant, lessee, or occupant thereof shall not affect any subtenant of such tenant, occupant, or lessee, and no action or proceeding to recover possession of such housing accommodations shall be maintainable by any landlord against such subtenant, so long as such

subtenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord may be entitled under the provisions of this act."

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF JOHN A. SUTTER

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of (H. Res. 325), authorizing the Clerk of the House to transmit to the California State Library photostatic copies of certain papers in support of the bill, H. R. 3818 Forty-fourth Congress, for the relief of John A. Sutter, a noted California character.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the California State Library at Sacramento, Calif., photostatic copies of the memorial and attendant papers in the files of the House relating to the bill H. R. 3818 of the Forty-fourth Congress entitled "An act for the relief of John A. Sutter," the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the California State Library."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow following the business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE RUSSIAN ESPIONAGE SYSTEM

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the principal characteristic of the Russian intelligence system is not, as it is in the west, a systematic functioning of agen-

cies which laboriously collect material and then fit the results into an intelligence pattern, but it is the clever and brilliant exploitation of the talents, qualities, and capabilities of individuals who, placed skillfully in the jobs best suited to them, produce the most brilliant results.

We must recognize from the very beginning that the Russian espionage service has a much larger supply of men of this type than the countries of the west, because the Russian as an individual has, by his very nature, the requisites for such difficult work. The Russian has two qualities in which he is enormously superior to the civilized nations of western Europe—imagination and sympathy for persons and for situations.

In order to counter the work of Russian agents and to be secretly on guard against the Russian espionage service, the most important thing by far is to take these two qualities into account continually and never to swerve from this conviction, even if circumstances seem to warrant. This implies that a person charged with such tasks must, to say the least, be a match for these typically Russian characteristics and stand in a certain inner relationship toward them. I believe this to be possible only when the person concerned has grown up among these people and knows their every shade of expression and their every gesture, and knows how to interpret them correctly.

As a matter of fact, the purely technical recognition of the system as it manifests itself externally at any given time—and is moreover subject to change—and combating such a system with technical means is doomed to failure for the individual member of this machine is not merely a marionette but is charged with the task of solving his particular problem by his own ingenuity.

The most disastrous mistake which can be made in attempting to counter Russian espionage is the assumption that the Russian agent is dependent on the system and its directives. The Russian agent is always tied to his objectives but is free in his choice of methods of gaining his ends. We must all recognize that the Communist ideology simplifies tremendously the work of the Russian espionage agencies by acquiring, without difficulty, collaborators, and nuclei of activity in all countries.

The development of the Russian Information Service from the Czarist OKHRANA, which was taken over in part by the Communists to CHEKA, OGPU, NKVD, and finally MVD, is well known and needs no further comment here. The entire machinery of the Russian Intelligence Service is subordinate to the MVD and divided mainly into two parts:

(a) The Agency of the Interior.

(b) The Agency of the Exterior.

The Agency of the Exterior, which is again divided into many agencies—Information, Political, Military, Espionage, Counter-Espionage, Sabotage, Geographical, and so forth—which collaborate among themselves only so far as is necessary, is not only in charge of the work of agents but also has the disposal of its own troops, special units, border police, and directs also partisan activities. The basic structure

of the organization differs in no marked respect from that of other countries. It is only the method and the procedure, and these are the most important, that must be evaluated separately.

It is important to know that the espionage groups attached to military units—corps and armies—are given their missions by these units but have a free hand in carrying out their missions. They might be called agents for the unit. This system of freedom of execution cannot be emphasized enough.

It has already been pointed out that the communistic ideology greatly aids, abets, and simplifies the Russian espionage service. Since communism has its adherents in every country, the Russian intelligence service needs to utilize only very few Russian agents and can rely for the rest on the political followers of communism in foreign countries who obligingly accomplish every task, often without knowing for what purposes they are being used. Russian agents themselves are a choice group who have been schooled politically and technically and who as residents in a foreign country constitute the center of espionage activity in their district.

The agents and their assistants usually pose before the native population as advocates of communism, increase party membership, and incorporate unwitting new members into espionage activity. They spread a net of collaborators over their particular district with the complete confidence of their superiors in Russia after first having thoroughly outlined the work to be done in their district; but their collaborators on the other hand, which they have recruited from the native population as new members or as old members of the Communist Party, are so definitely steered by them that they never acquire knowledge concerning the purposes for which they are actually being used.

If they are told anything at all, it is only to the barest minimum necessary for the accomplishment of their assignments. Consequently, if they are ever interrogated, they are, indeed, able to give very little information.

The residents stay aloof from public life, are known only to a few collaborators or only to those who, as contact men, enjoy special consideration. These contact men furnish all connection between the leading agents and the subordinate collaborators. They organize the communication service, relay orders, and stimulate recruiting. One of their very important duties is to continue the most careful surveillance of the persons in their charge.

A very important requisite in the Russian Espionage Service is camouflage, which is handled with the greatest diligence and in which the Russians have met with simply phenomenal success. The majority of errors made in combating spy organizations of any nation are due to the failure to give this problem due consideration. In order to conceal themselves and their activities, the residents are ready to apply any means whatsoever.

Camouflaging begins with infiltration into the new country. It will be remembered that in every country there have occurred periods in which suddenly a

number of agents in the service of Russia have been arrested. These agents were, for the most part, not outstanding personalities with outstanding assignments. Almost always this has been a maneuver cleverly directed to conceal or cover the appearance and activity of the most important spies. This type of camouflaging is particularly suited to border crossing and/or infiltrations, and today under present border conditions throughout the world these tactics find wide application.

The exact technique of concealment is the following: A number of persons having counterfeit papers, which, however, are not entirely correct and not difficult to examine, are sent across the border, and they are given unimportant but clearly defined assignments. These people are especially intended to fall into the hands of the security agencies of foreign countries, and this is exactly what happens, as a result of their lack of experience; and they are so used that the real agent in the meantime can take the steps necessary to accomplishment of his mission.

The persons who are thus made use of are, of course, not informed about their real purpose and thus ruthlessly sacrificed. As a matter of fact, it frequently happens that the security agencies are often given information about these people by the contact men themselves. These residents in foreign countries have a fixed number of such persons at their disposal, always send them out as decoys and sacrifice them for the sake of concealment of their assignments and their own safety. This is based on the assumption that Russian activity in a foreign country is well known to the intelligence agencies of that country and therefore utilizes persons who are of no importance and can give no essential information, who, however, keep these intelligence agencies busy, side-track them, and, in addition, provide them with the illusion of success. Of course there are also clever cases in which the individuals involved—this being a category of select and specially trained persons who are also confidence men—have the express mission to let themselves be apprehended, in order then to set the intelligence organizations on the wrong track, according to a carefully delineated plan.

This category of men, and very frequently of women—who play a major part in Russian espionage—are the most dangerous and inscrutable, because they play the dual role of appearing as traitors to their own cause, and apparently let themselves be reformed, only to regain freedom and to resume activity in some new capacity. This struggle with phonies of this type is tremendously difficult, for the Russians, by using such tricks, have been able to give rise to such an amount of mistakes on the part of the counter intelligence, causing them to vacillate constantly between the important and the unimportant, that many an intelligence bureau seems confronted with a chaos of contradictions.

In the case of border security it is necessary to know all the shadings of the

psychology of the Russians and understand these subtleties in order to be able to classify the personalities at work there; and even if these cases involve non-Russians, it is important to know immediately what this particular person means to the Russian intelligence, and what category of work he is being used for. This understanding and correctness of analysis is feasible only from one case to the next; as soon as an attempt is made to develop a rigid system or to adhere to norms, the result is bound to be hopelessly unsuccessful. For each case is different, original, and made so with the greatest ingenuity. In this camouflaging process the Russians often go so far as to expose and denounce their agents publicly in newspapers, for tactical reasons, in order to relieve them of the suspicion of being in Russian employ and to taint them if possible with the suspicion of being traitors in the service of foreign governments.

The legend is a requisite of the espionage organizations of all nations, but in the Russian espionage it assumes a special meaning, which is closely bound to the gift of fantasy which the Russians possess. The Russian agent who is picked for an important assignment goes through a training course in which he is not only prepared for the fulfillment of his task in the field of politics, warfare, and espionage, but in which his entire nature is exactly observed and checked.

On the basis of these observations and of the opinion advanced by the various specialists, the legend for the man or woman in question is concocted. This is accomplished by allowing the person in question a free hand for thinking up and submitting such a story. But going on the premise that a person does not know himself, this story is psychologically corrected by specialists.

Thus the legend is made to fit the agent, not he to fit the legend, so that he acquires the inner certainty of being able to move freely in accordance with the dictates of his nature. As much care is taken to preserve the external circumstances of his life, such as age, vocation, appearance, and so forth, as to preserve intelligence, education, and inclinations and all those factors which a man cannot conceal successfully, if at all; with the result that a well-rounded view of the person is taken which fits him and makes it easy for him to play his role without faltering.

Agents who have to change assignments and places of activity frequently, as well as others, are given several legends or the same ones with variations; but in this respect great caution is exercised by examining the person very diligently, for it is obvious that the chances for discovery due to self-contradiction are very great.

For trained Russian agents picked for important missions, this legend is practiced before such men are allowed to go to work. These practices are regarded as highly important and are not conducted superficially, and persons who fail in these tests are regarded as unfit for the real task. Furthermore, proper equipment and correct clothing are issued in keeping with the legend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement of the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Burke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TEMPORARY CONTINUATION OF REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 148, to authorize the temporary continuation of regulation of consumer credit, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FUR SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the commercial-fur farmer finds himself in a deplorable financial position today. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee recognized this situation and appointed a special fact-finding fur committee. This condition is a result of certain definite legislative and administrative actions. First of all, the Secretary of Commerce in June 1946 sent a delegation to Russia which was a second "Mission to Moscow." This

delegation was supposed to increase commerce with the United States. You will note in the following report that \$241,000,000 worth of furs were imported into the United States in 1946, including 67.5 millions from Russia. The total agriculture imports in 1946 was \$2,300,000,000. The fur imports were over 10 percent of the total agriculture imports. The fur farmer surely furnished 241 millions of the much discussed dollar exchange. Second, we saw fur included in the excise tax list and designated a luxury.

If \$99,000,000 was collected in 1946 from the excise tax on furs just why should not this industry be given equal consideration with other groups of American farmers? Why take the toll off the fur farmer when the other types of agriculture are protected by embargoes? Why take this 99 millions collected through the fur industry and spend it on special privilege crops?

After listening to all the hearings I cannot refrain from concluding that the fur farmer is deserving of legislative protection afforded other farm groups. The fur farmers have made constructive legislative proposals. One bill has been introduced that will require truth in labeling for furs comparable to the truth in fabric legislation. This has been introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH O'HARA, of Minnesota. Other legislative proposals are under consideration and not a one of these proposals is asking the Congress for any special privilege legislation. Not a one of the proposals is asking for any legislative protection not afforded other agricultural groups, and nowhere nearly as much legislative protection now enjoyed by certain crops.

The report on fur hearings is as follows:

THE FUR SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, from the subcommittee on fur, submitted the following preliminary report:

THE CURRENT FUR SITUATION

This committee was appointed by the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to ascertain facts regarding the fur industry in all its phases and in connection with all its problems which might rightly receive the consideration of the Congress. Phases given study included fur raising (wild breeding and fur farming, the latter also including Angora rabbits raised for wool) and trapping and the operations of fur buyers, brokers, dressers, dyers, manufacturers and other processors, dealers, handlers, and agencies concerned in fur raising, processing, and sales.

Hearings were held, with representatives of the various groups engaged in the industry and of the State, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and the Tariff Commission giving testimony, on April 17 and 18 and May 19, 20, and 21, 1947.

The hearings disclosed that the problems of the several groups in the industry were varied, and some of them had grown out of the war. Others of these problems appeared to be due to the activities of agencies of our Government and of the peculiar methods by which other governments operated in the handling of their own fur situations. Testimony disclosed that—

The fur-farming industry

(1) The fur-farming industry was, and is, in a serious economic position. The breeders

contended that this distress was due to (a) above-the-average imports, which some described as "flooding" of the market by foreign furs; (b) the establishment of the excise tax and the confusion resulting from the indecision as to its continuation; (c) a lack of credit facilities that are used by other agricultural producers of the United States; and (d) an unwise commercial approach when, in June 1946, the Commerce Department sent a delegation to Russia to encourage shipments to the United States. (Official records showed, however, that of \$241,000,000 worth of fur imports in 1946, \$67,500,000 were from Russia.)

(2) The fur farmers and trappers asked for more protection on imports in some form, since only silver- and black-fox furs enjoy tariff protection (37½ percent ad valorem) at this time. Since fur garments are assessed duties up to 50 percent ad valorem, up to 40 percent ad valorem on imported dressed and dyed pelts, up to 37½ percent on dressed furs if not dyed, and none whatsoever on the raw pelts, except silver and black fox, the fur breeder felt his labor was entitled to equal legislative consideration. The trapper was also placed on record as seeking such protection.

(3) The fur farmers suggested the advisability of "truth in fur labeling" legislation, comparable to the "truth in fabric" legislation passed by the Seventy-sixth Congress in regard to wool.

(4) The fur farmers suggested a program whereby a "tanner tax" might be placed on domestically produced furs to be utilized in research in behalf of the fur industry.

(5) The fur farmers proposed that consideration be given their industry in regard to research problems comparable to the research being carried on in respect to other agricultural fields and, as stated above, wished to make a direct contribution through the proposed tanner's tax imposed on themselves.

(6) The fur farmers disapproved of the importation of furs from a foreign country that is subsidizing its own producers. Their contention was, and the evidence appeared factual, that Canada is at the present time subsidizing its producers. The farmers also felt that they should not be placed in direct competition with a government which is operating in the fur business, as is the case with Russia and with other totalitarian countries, as long as other elements of American labor receive protection.

(7) The fur farmers contended that the excise tax of 20 percent was placed on furs on the theory that they were a luxury, yet only about 3 percent of the imports paid any import duty, indicating that they were not classed as luxury items when imported. They also contended that most fur coats and similar garments are not luxuries, but necessities, in a large part of the United States and, because of their considerably longer life than cloth garments, often constitute an economy for the consumer.

(8) The rabbit-wool industry has been developing rapidly in the United States and its product finding more and new uses. Because of its peculiar qualities and uses, Angora rabbit growers contend that their product should not be classified so as to have the same duty as sheep wool. Spokesmen for the Angora rabbit breeders, finding and developing new uses for their product to offer possibilities of an expanded market, contend they should be accorded a greater share of the American market. They likewise complain that their product is not recognized in classifications set up by the Department of Agriculture, being disregarded or forgotten following the transfer of supervision of fur animals from the Department of the Interior to Agriculture. They also complain there are no Federal standards to include provisions for the handling of Angora rabbit wool under the Federal Warehousing Act.

Imports of furs in 1946 and the early part of 1947 came in at a notably high rate, both in numbers and in value, a fact shown in tables presented at the end of this report. The fur raisers contended this dumping of foreign furs had bankrupted many fur farmers and, if continued, threatens to destroy their operation entirely. They indicated their belief that continued unrestricted imports would eventually have an adverse effect on the remainder of the American fur industry by eliminating the American source and placing the industry at the mercy of foreign governmental regulations or unpredictable factors of foreign supply.

The position of the fur trade

Representatives of the various phases of the fur trade were generally in accord in their position, testimony disclosed. The trade witnesses' testimony indicated:

(1) New York City has become the fur center of the world through the labor and import conditions which have existed, and there was fear that a disturbing of these conditions would allow other nations to destroy that leadership and reduce the employment of a large segment of well-paid labor.

(2) Part of the troubles of certain elements of the fur-farming industry was due to the whims of Dame Fashion which decreed style changes and lessened the demand for certain types of fur.

(3) Some did not feel that any legislation was needed for truth in fur labeling, believing that the Federal Trade Commission has sufficient regulatory powers. Others could see no harm in suggested truth in fur labeling legislation.

(4) The fur trade was in complete unanimity, favoring a status quo insofar as import duties are concerned. Opposing the fur farmer's desires for a reappraisal of the duties imposed, the trade felt that the present set-up, wherein the manufactured garment enjoyed a 50-percent ad valorem duty, the dressed and dyed pelts up to 40 percent ad valorem, and the dressed pelts up to 37½ percent, with the raw pelts bearing no duty, except in the case of silver and black fox (37½ percent), should be maintained. Entry of processed furs would decrease employment of processing labor, they maintained, as would duties against all raw furs.

(5) The fur trade cited the necessity of well-qualified workmen, noting high pay scales, in connection with the manufacturing of garments and the processing of furs for them, and the large number of people employed in the industry. Some indicated their feeling that it was more important to continue this phase of the entire fur industry on a full-scale basis than to give too much consideration to the smaller number concerned in fur raising.

(6) Opposition to the placing of import duties on raw furs, other than silver and black fox, was also noted by the fur brokers and manufacturers on the ground that the industry could use all of the \$100,000,000 output of American fur farmers and that the additional foreign fur imports were necessary for the other phases of the fur industry to survive and continue to employ a large segment of high-paid labor.

(7) Figures citing average costs of fur garments, considering longer wear, as compared to other types of material, stressed the contention that fur garments were not luxuries demanding an excise tax but, rather, utilitarian items and economies.

(8) One trade witness gave a figure of 40 percent as the percentage of furs exported after manufacture. United States Tariff Commission data, however, gave fur exports for 1946 as \$5,669,347 in value for fur-wearing apparel; \$18,000,000 worth of undressed furs; \$1,300,000 of dressed or dyed furs, or a total of \$25,000,000 fur exports. This \$25,000,000 in exports is evidently about 10 percent of the imports, since \$241,000,000 worth of fur pelts as pelts were imported in 1946.

General observations

(1) Fur farming is becoming a farm enterprise of considerable magnitude, and its problems deserve legislative consideration to compare with that given other agricultural groups of the United States.

(2) As wild fur animals decrease in number, increase in demand for farm furs can be expected.

(3) Fur farmers make use of waste products in their operations. Alaska, with its fish-cannery waste and other fish resources, provides a food for fur farms and may thus be important both as a source of feed for some farms in the United States proper and as the site of additional farms.

(4) The fur industry is more than a billion-dollar industry, although the domestic fur farmer has not been receiving a very large percentage of what the consumer pays for the products manufactured from his pelts.

(5) Fur farming is a further diversification of agriculture and, as a diversion system of farming, should be an addition to a well-rounded program for American agriculture.

(6) Rabbit wool is entitled to the legislative consideration given the products of other groups and should not be classed with sheep wool for various purposes.

(7) The serious financial troubles of the fur ranchers and farmers, as disclosed in testimony, later hearing discussions indicated could be partially solved by better methods of financing in some of their operations. These methods might include possible use of the Central Bank for Cooperatives in some phases and use of other existing agricultural credit set-ups for individuals or fur-farm units in others. In this respect the individual fur farmer was cited as feeling he is entitled to the same credit sources available to other branches of agricultural endeavor, particularly since the regulation of fur farming has been transferred to the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

(8) Pelts of sheep in various classes (mouton, et cetera) may be imported free, but wool clipped and imported separately would demand duty.

(9) Confusion results when an excise tax is assessed against mouton as a fur, although the product is a sheep pelt with the wool attached.

Tables on furs and fur products

The following table shows the number and dollar value of fur imports from 1920 to 1947:

TABLE 1.—Furs, dressed or dressed and dyed, and undressed,¹ United States imports for consumption, 1920-46

[In thousands]

Year	Quantity (pelts)	Value
1920.....	132,330	\$87,471
1921.....	80,194	38,319
1922.....	148,153	64,909
1923.....	127,255	82,216
1924.....	146,621	82,846
1925.....	166,932	105,253
1926.....	165,394	109,423
1927.....	164,240	126,916
1928.....	135,721	115,021
1929.....	134,732	118,563
1930.....	119,638	64,804
1931.....	122,061	52,781
1932.....	93,343	27,239
1933.....	138,007	35,608
1934.....	121,180	39,091
1935.....	197,342	49,871
1936.....	167,273	77,048
1937.....	149,551	80,637
1938.....	94,829	43,128
1939.....	141,028	52,678
1940.....	169,716	75,876
1941.....	160,011	106,172
1942.....	93,213	70,557
1943.....	119,599	94,128
1944.....	138,812	127,561
1945 ²	141,390	146,328
1946 ³	192,134	241,274

¹ Includes only whole pelts.
² Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

The following table shows the exports of fur wearing apparel from 1922 to 1947:

TABLE 2.—Fur wearing apparel:¹ United States exports of domestic merchandise, 1922-46 and January-March 1947

Year	Quantity (number)	Value
1922.....	(²)	\$169,617
1923.....	(²)	160,797
1924.....	(²)	187,217
1925.....	(²)	207,698
1926.....	2,421	111,260
1927.....	2,776	152,631
1928.....	5,200	184,445
1929.....	7,425	297,956
1930.....	8,686	223,432
1931.....	5,335	133,071
1932.....	1,857	34,592
1933.....	1,531	34,029
1934.....	1,849	37,366
1935.....	1,871	41,811
1936.....	7,557	110,839
1937.....	5,308	129,256
1938.....	4,035	108,490
1939.....	3,709	127,914
1940.....	7,328	161,547
1941.....	9,555	235,740
1942.....	14,494	446,083
1943.....	17,341	546,408
1944.....	19,532	1,617,400
1945 ²	25,056	3,086,640
1946 ³	48,023	5,669,347
1947 (January-March) ³	6,811	1,002,498

¹ Not separately classified prior to 1922, included with dressed and manufactures of furs and fur skins.

² Not available.

³ Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

In addition to the above, there were exported, in 1946, \$18,009,313 in undressed furs and \$1,345,567 in dressed or dyed furs, making a total of \$25,024,227, as compared to the \$241,274,000 of fur imports in 1946.

The following table shows the numbers and values of pelts imported from 1920 to 1946:

TABLE 3.—Furs (except silver or black fox), undressed: United States imports, by principal sources, 1920, 1921, 1923, and 1925-46

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Belgium	France	Germany	Rumania	Soviet Union	United Kingdom	Canada	Argentina	India	China	Japan	Iran	Turkey	Afghanistan	Australia	New Zealand	Union of South Africa ¹	All other countries	Total
1920.....	3,232	3,398	3,086	—	4,765	16,811	13,097	2,100	952	10,567	5,307	160	1,668	—	12,196	2,314	14	4,761	84,428
1921.....	665	1,359	2,072	6	345	9,137	9,880	2,951	1,069	3,869	1,247	32	209	—	2,073	682	14	1,164	36,774
1923.....	2,606	2,973	9,646	18	821	17,779	11,394	2,010	337	14,359	1,755	139	683	8	4,981	919	659	8,552	79,639
1925.....	4,026	4,368	6,607	49	5,776	19,966	11,914	3,453	290	15,450	2,594	142	822	—	10,657	2,100	895	12,484	101,593
1926.....	5,474	4,478	8,881	209	4,446	21,852	11,927	3,588	271	15,101	2,874	114	530	13	11,829	2,118	1,034	12,511	107,250
1927.....	6,013	6,438	12,952	175	2,429	20,720	14,515	5,020	181	22,902	4,610	168	707	—	10,972	1,073	1,185	13,570	123,630
1928.....	6,591	6,984	15,996	169	3,159	17,504	13,368	4,423	310	17,052	3,550	375	1,054	—	5,758	540	1,257	10,693	108,783
1929.....	6,807	6,158	18,598	120	4,963	16,409	10,928	3,855	181	15,593	4,217	44	835	—	7,137	677	1,546	9,981	108,049
1930.....	2,719	3,241	10,075	37	3,709	13,688	6,573	1,874	173	6,967	1,965	71	319	—	2,282	313	524	3,124	57,645
1931.....	938	2,706	7,656	118	735	13,383	5,369	1,920	427	7,048	1,447	42	249	—	2,198	314	847	2,553	47,950
1932.....	323	1,301	3,047	19	931	7,396	2,730	967	171	3,950	1,413	7	218	—	764	129	74	1,667	25,137
1933.....	753	2,023	3,550	98	1,481	9,559	3,310	1,083	381	4,129	1,306	19	143	—	2,645	635	542	1,675	33,332
1934.....	855	2,654	1,786	51	2,129	8,606	4,283	1,237	344	7,632	1,855	34	235	—	3,215	676	234	2,339	38,165
1935.....	1,225	3,220	1,593	562	3,188	12,347	5,086	1,955	809	5,421	1,845	56	119	19	5,636	1,615	482	3,069	48,247
1936.....	3,058	4,973	907	1,869	6,432	22,490	6,857	2,287	798	7,260	2,581	303	204	—	7,382	2,804	836	3,652	74,723
1937.....	2,923	5,206	203	2,847	11,597	15,933	5,707	2,370	916	3,137	3,137	416	464	1,378	6,914	1,873	1,209	4,764	78,542
1938.....	1,314	1,447	103	1,597	12,139	2,367	4,945	1,286	1,008	3,476	933	395	222	—	3,703	1,800	988	1,599	42,035
1939.....	898	2,797	274	1,069	12,327	2,136	6,433	1,055	670	4,379	1,272	497	241	6,667	2,360	748	2,813	3,193	49,759
1940.....	422	2,473	7	658	12,942	2,784	10,694	2,154	1,019	6,287	1,130	2,015	470	12,864	5,315	1,429	7,760	3,239	73,662
1941.....	16	(²)	—	35	21,620	4,000	12,872	5,458	1,440	6,144	1,305	2,132	315	16,933	13,954	2,702	11,261	3,780	104,057
1942.....	—	—	—	—	15,321	3,822	14,726	3,704	1,671	107	—	1,810	288	7,758	8,069	1,934	6,767	2,380	68,957
1943.....	—	—	—	—	17,917	3,756	20,583	6,672	817	14	—	1,165	218	9,334	12,853	3,085	9,322	4,730	90,466
1944.....	—	—	—	—	32,090	4,516	21,703	5,605	3,517	1	(²)	2,010	548	19,776	13,104	3,624	11,019	6,676	124,189
1945 ³	39	1,151	—	—	26,325	3,708	21,569	8,296	3,154	35	—	3,811	1,093	31,723	14,689	2,992	16,686	8,113	143,474
1946 ³	1,152	4,182	4	1	67,495	4,925	18,361	11,029	8,034	14,083	825	6,628	2,019	34,104	22,886	3,168	19,664	20,002	235,563

¹ Before 1928 may include some imports from British South Africa.

² Less than 500.

³ Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce, April 1947.

NOTE.—Imports for 1920-33 and 1945-46 are general imports; those for 1934-44 are imports for consumption. Imports of silver- or black-fox furs are shown in table XIV.

R. F. M.

In addition to the importations listed in table 3, there were 53,000 silver- and black-fox pelts imported, valued at \$2,500,000, making a total import of over \$241,000,000 in fur pelts in 1946.

The following two tables from the United States Tariff Commission show the duty status of dressed, undressed, and manufactured furs:

TABLE 4.—Furs and manufactures thereof

Tariff paragraph	Kind	Tariff status	Trade agreement
1681	Furs and fur skins, not specially provided for, undressed:		
	Mink, beaver, and muskrat.....	Duty-free status bound.....	(Canada, January 1936. Canada, January 1939. Canada, January 1939. Canada, January 1939. Iran, June 1944. United Kingdom, January 1939. Iran, June 1944. Canada, January 1939. United Kingdom, January 1939. Canada, January 1939. Netherlands, February 1936. United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Canada, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Peru, July 1942.
	Wolf.....	do.....	
	Kid and goat.....	do.....	
	Skunk.....	do.....	
	Prairie wolf, lynx, and fisher.....	do.....	
	Moleskins.....	do.....	
	Ermine, fitch, moneky, pony, sable, and squirrel.....	do.....	
	Guanacito, nutria, wildcat, ocelot, and seal.....	do.....	
	Otter.....	do.....	
	Lamb and sheep:		
	Caracul and Persian lamb.....	do.....	(United Kingdom, January 1939. Iran, June 1944. United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944. United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944. United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944. Turkey, May 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iran, June 1944. United Kingdom, January 1939. Turkey, May 1939. Iran, June 1944.
	Other.....	do.....	
	Fox (other than silver or black fox).....	do.....	
	Hare.....	do.....	
	Jackal and badger.....	do.....	
	Marten.....	do.....	
1519 (a)	Dressed furs and dressed fur skins (except silver or black fox):		
	If not dyed:		
	Lamb and sheep.....	15 percent ad valorem ¹	(United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. Iceland, November 1943. United Kingdom, January 1939. Argentina, November 1941. United Kingdom, January 1939. Do.
	Caracul and Persian lamb.....	12½ percent ad valorem.....	
	Goat and kid, and hare.....	15 percent ad valorem.....	
	Other (except coney, rabbit, dog, and fur seal skins).....	12½ percent ad valorem.....	
	If dyed: All, except coney, rabbit, hare, dog, goat, kid, and fur seal skins.....	15 percent ad valorem.....	
		20 percent ad valorem.....	
1519 (a)	Plates, mats, linings, strips, and crosses of dressed goat or kid skins, if not dyed.....	12½ percent ad valorem.....	Argentina, November 1941.
1519 (b)	Plates, mats, linings, strips, and crosses of hare, lamb, and sheep furs (except caracul and Persian lamb), if not dyed.....	17½ percent ad valorem.....	Do.
1519 (c)	Silver- or black-fox furs or skins, dressed or undressed, not specially provided for.....	37½ percent ad valorem.....	Canada, January 1939.

¹ Superseded.

TABLE 5.—Furs and manufactures thereof

Tariff paragraph	Item	Tariff history		
		Act of 1922	Act of 1930	1947 rate
		Percent ad valorem	Percent ad valorem	Percent ad valorem
1519 (c)	Undressed furs:			
1681	Silver or black fox.....	(1) 50	(1) 50	37½
	All other kinds.....			
	Dressed furs:			
	If not dyed:			
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox.....	50	50	37½
1519 (a)	Coney and rabbit, dog, and seal.....	25	25	25
	Goat and kid, hare, and lamb and sheep (except caracul and Persian lamb).....	25	25	12½
	All other kinds.....	25	25	15
	If dyed:			
1519 (c)	Silver or black fox.....	50	50	37½
1519 (a)	Goat and kid, hare, coney and rabbit, dog and seal.....	25	30	30
	All other kinds.....	25	30	20
1519 (a)	Plates, mats, linings, etc., of dog, goat, or kid skins:			
	Dressed, not dyed:			
	Of dogskins.....	10	25	25
	Of goat or kid skins.....	10	25	12½
	Dressed and dyed.....	10	30	30
1519 (b)	Plates, mats, linings, etc., of fur (except silver or black fox and dog, goat, or kid):			
	Dressed, not dyed:			
	Of hare, lamb, and sheep furs (except caracul and Persian lamb).....	40	35	17½
	Other.....	40	35	35
	Dressed and dyed.....	40	40	40
	Manufactures of furs (except plates, mats, linings, etc.) further advanced than dressing, prepared for use as material:			
	If not dyed.....	40	35	35
	If dyed.....	40	40	40
1519 (d)	Wearing apparel of fur:			
	Of hides or skins of cattle of the bovine species, not specifically provided for.....	15	15	15
	Of dog, goat, or kid skins, not specifically provided for.....	15	35	35
1519 (e)	Of other furs.....	50	50	50
1519 (e)	Articles of fur, except wearing apparel.....	50	50	50

¹ Free.

GROWING IMPORTANCE DEMANDS ATTENTION

The subcommittee feels that a rather comprehensive picture of the fur industry has been obtained in these hearings, which are printed in parts 1 and 2 of the Fur Situation (hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Fur of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 1st sess.). Every effort was made to give every branch of the industry full hearing to obtain all facts incident to the industry and its problems. Therein it was indicated that the fur industry, in which this Nation has become the outstanding international leader, may properly deserve more consideration from the Congress and other divisions of Government than it has been given in the past.

This report is hereby submitted to the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

REID F. MURRAY,
Chairman,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
NORRIS COTTON,
W. K. GRANGER,
JNO. L. McMILLAN,
THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
E. L. BARTLETT.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks in the Appendix of the Record the report of this fur-investigating subcommittee that will give the people of this country the facts in connection with the fur industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that probably they imported the furs to pay for the 175,000 tons of steel that we shipped out of the country to Russia in the past year, steel that we so badly needed for pipe, for drilling of oil wells, for pipe lines, and so forth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it poor Government policy to send out any delegation to ask anybody to send anything in here that we do not need. They will send enough in without sending out any delegations for that purpose.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I wish to take this opportunity to express my own personal appreciation for the fine investigation made by our friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], especially on agricultural matters. No Member of the House has been more helpful along that line than he has. I wonder what is going to become of the sheep and the wool industry. We voted sometime ago for a bill to give relief to the wool growers of this country, but that bill was vetoed by the President. Now, I have received many letters from my constituents and from all parts of Kentucky urging me, before Congress adjourns, to try to help do something to protect the sheep and wool industry. Now, what is the prospect for relief to the wool growers and the sheep raisers in this country at this time?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will say to my colleague from Kentucky that I appreciate his asking me that question, but I am sure that he realizes that that is something that is not in my hands, and that the leadership on the floor will have to answer that question.

I will say, however, that this wool industry is just one more example of what has been going on under the present administration. They have deceived the League of Women Voters from one end of the country to the other, talking about reciprocity and good-neighbor policy, and they have erected more trade barricades than were ever erected in the history of our country. Now they are going the wreck the sheep industry. Sheep numbers have been reduced by over one-third the past 4 years. Then people ask why they find no lamb or mutton at the market place. In the last 3, 4, 5, and 6 years, from 25 to 35 percent of the total customs receipts have come from wool. Then they take that money and they use it under what is known as section 32 funds. When we had the agricultural bill up here I paid my respects for a couple of minutes to the misuse of these section 32 funds. I cannot understand it. Talk about a loose fiscal policy. It is not only a loose fiscal policy, but it is a loony one, too. When you take 30 percent of the customs receipts on commodities like livestock and wool and then turn around and use that money for oversubsidizing soil-depleting crops, it does not make sense. And I call attention to the fact that in these section 32 funds that they secure by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts, they even go so far as to subsidize insulating material made out of cotton. One company, if you please, has had over \$1,000,000 in subsidies for making insulating material for houses. There is no use having a soil-conservation program when you do this to the livestock industry and then use the funds to oversubsidize soil-depleting crops, and I kind of hope that these general agricultural hearings that are going to be held all over the country will get some semblance of common sense and common justice and equity between the various groups of our farmers and between all groups of our society.

Mr. ROBSION. I thank the gentleman for his very illuminating and informative statement. I knew when I asked the question that we could draw from the gentleman some information and facts worth while on this important subject.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman, and I presume sometime before we adjourn Saturday night that the wool bill will again be brought to the floor. I just take that for granted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

HUNGARY AND EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the refusal of the Soviet satellites to attend the Paris Conference has again turned the spotlight on eastern Europe. We realize as perhaps never before, that Europe has been split in two parts, that large areas and tens of millions of people are being cut off from what we like to call the "one world." Thus they are being prevented even from accepting assistance, and that is rather unusual in these pathetic years.

This is however not a new development, it is just the most striking consequence of an evolution which has been in progress since VE-day at least, if not since Tehran and Yalta.

It does not mean a new experience for the peoples involved as the same thing happened to them not so long ago, when Nazism was bent on establishing a European hegemony. After Munich, the world accepted the idea that, after all, Germany had some special interests in Lebensraum. The only surprising thing about it today, for us as well as for the peoples concerned is, that the same mistakes could have been repeated within such a short time, and that so little should have been done to prevent this repetition.

Eastern Europe is an integral and vital part of the old world. The decline of the Turkish and later of the Austro-Hungarian empires made it a bone of contention between the new great powers, Germany and Russia. All of us may remember what we have read in our textbooks on the Oriental question, which in the nineteenth century has so often shattered the peace.

This great area, stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic and Black Seas, is rich in manpower, in natural resources, but due to reasons of history and economics, it has never been properly developed. Inhabited by a host of small but able nations, it has never succeeded thus far in establishing a well-balanced unified political order, based on freedom and cooperation. It was a sort of hunting ground for expansionist powers and ideologies, for a ruthless game of power politics.

From an economic and strategic point of view, it is of paramount importance. Left alone, peaceful and satisfied, it could become the most important political and economic asset in European recovery. Tightly integrated in the economic and political system of a single great power, it is a base for further expansion and eventual conquest by force of arms.

Two World Wars were generated in this area. World War II was preceded by what we would call now a partition of Europe into spheres of influence. Seeking a balance of power, British statesmanship hoped to achieve that balance in 1938 by splitting Europe, by assigning to the Germans their legitimate share, that Lebensraum they had been claiming, the territories and peoples of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. But partition did not achieve stability. On the contrary, it was an inducement for further expansion.

sion. Yielding Austria to the Nazis did not save Czechoslovakia. Yielding on Czechoslovakia did not save Poland. And thus World War II roared into a holocaust.

And what has happened since? Shall I recall Teheran, Yalta, or the great design? Shall I recall how in the armistice agreements we assured predominance in these countries to the Russian members of the Allied Control Commission? Shall I recall our advice to the eastern European nations that they should have governments friendly to Russia? The long and strenuous negotiations for the peace treaties, when we yielded on almost all the points and cheered ourselves with the thought that we had reached the best possible settlements under given circumstances? How many vain protests did we launch against rigged elections, oppressive practices, and Soviet interference, always followed up by recognition of the puppet governments and the accomplished facts resulting from the very conditions against which we raised our voice?

Instead of telling the whole story, I will limit myself to recalling the happenings of the last few months. On March 12, 1947, the President of the United States made a memorable speech which was considered by many people as opening a new chapter in the foreign policy of the United States. After years of appeasement it sounded like an encouragement for all those who have been oppressed or threatened by oppression. Although limited in its concrete application to Greece and Turkey, it contained a promise that, "Wherever we find free peoples having difficulties in the maintenance of free institutions and difficulty against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes, we do not necessarily react in the same way each time but we propose to react." Those were brave words which our people applauded and all too soon forgot.

But the words of the President had a heartening effect on the peoples of eastern Europe. They were encouraged because they saw in them an official refutation of their worst fears, namely, that the United States of America was an at least tacit partner to an agreed partition of Europe, and that the famous Trieste-Stettin line was drawn with the consent of the most powerful nation in the world. And they saw in this declaration even more: a promise of at least continued concern and of at least some kind of positive action.

Did we live up to these expectations? Did we act in accordance with our words? Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians have since been victims of continued totalitarian aggression. They resisted as well as they could. And what did we do about it?

Let us first take the case of Hungary. The duly elected Prime Minister, leader of the majority party was ousted from his office by Soviet interference and by Communist pressure. The President of the United States termed the event an outrage and declared, that we would not stand by idly. Senator VANDENBERG, while recommending that ratification of

the Peace Treaty with that country spoke of a treacherous conquest. Finally the Department of State sent a protest to Russia and stated that the then recent events were the most flagrant interference in Hungarian affairs. The protest was sharply rejected by Russia, and we heard nothing further of the action that may seem appropriate which the Department's note indicated was to be the basis for their case of refusal to recognize the Communist coup.

On the contrary, we ratified the Peace Treaties with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, as an important contribution to the reestablishment of the sovereignty of these countries. We did so in the hope that the Soviets would do the same. The Soviets, however, did not act upon the peace treaties, because they prefer unsettled conditions to settled ones. Thus our ratification of these abject treaties was just a vain gesture, which would even appear as an implicit endorsement of what is going on in eastern Europe.

We did even more. The Department of State granted formal recognition to the new Soviet puppet Hungarian Government, because it wanted to be represented in Hungary. The maintaining of our listening post on the Danube is however in no way dependent on formal recognition. The United States is to be represented in Hungary anyhow, as the Department must be fully aware because under the Armistice agreement, the United States is a member of the Allied Control Commission, and under the Peace Treaty, the head of the American mission is the member of the commission interpreting the dispositions and supervising the execution of the Treaty.

We offered asylum to Prime Minister Nagy, but I have not seen in the press that he has been received by any responsible officer of the American Government. He is certainly happy to enjoy freedom from fear as a refugee in our country. But after all our Government has said about the case of his country, can this be considered appropriate action? Do the official statements not commit us to something more than we have done thus far? The Soviet Government has every reason to believe that our words of tender concern for their victims mean nothing at all, and that after once blowing our horn they can proceed to devour their victims at their leisure.

In Bulgaria, Mr. Nikolai Petkov, the courageous leader of the Agrarian Party, reduced to a minority by abject and oppressive electoral practices, was arrested on June 7. The charges against him sound familiar to everybody who knows the foul play going on in Red-dominated eastern Europe. He was charged with conspiracy against the Government of the Comintern agents. Mr. Petkov declared bluntly, that his arrest was nothing but a prolongation of what has already happened in Hungary. A few days later 23 members of the Bulgarian opposition party were deprived of their seats in the national assembly.

The acting political representative of the United States inquired the reasons which led to the arrest of Mr. Petkov and was answered by the head of the Bulgarian Government, that the leader of

the opposition would be tried by the sovereign country of Bulgaria, and not in London or Washington. We issued a statement on that incident. We assured the world, that Mr. Petkov's leadership of the Bulgarian opposition has evoked deep sympathies in the United States. We referred to Yalta, to the armistice agreement, and to article 2 of the peace treaty. We declared that the present regime in Bulgaria will be on trial in the minds of all freedom-loving peoples outside Bulgaria. And nothing has happened outside since—nothing whatever.

The drive to crush democracy, even when it was reduced to opposition, was continued in Rumania as well. Hundreds of the opposition party and non-party members were arrested, and our Department of State, keeping its own political record straight, dutifully protested. It recognized that the arrests "represent a deliberate effort at the suppression or terroristic intimidation of democratic elements of the Rumanian population who oppose the present regime." The Communist-dominated Rumanian Government was, however, not in the least impressed by our protests. In the last days, the great old man of Rumania, Dr. Iuliu Maniu, leader of the National Peasant Party was arrested with his Vice President and several other top members of his party. I should like to add that even the Nazi regime in its day did not dare to persecute Dr. Maniu, who has been the most respected statesman of his country.

Perhaps it should be pointed out that Mr. Nagy, Mr. Petkov, Dr. Maniu are peasant leaders, representing the majority of their peoples. Actually, the peasants are the backbone of all eastern Europe. Fiercely individualist and hard working, they are the strongest, even though not the exclusive foundation of a truly democratic system in those countries. Their aims are simple. They want individual property rights, and they want to be masters in their homes and not pushed around by government or its police, and they want to have a voice in politics. The police state under which they have to live now is but a complete negation of these basic aims. It is therefore significant that the Red Fascist governments in eastern Europe want to crush them as their most dangerous potential opponents. And it shows as well that the period of democratic face saving has come to an end; the face has been smashed by the Red Fascists.

Everyone who observed the happenings in that part of the world is aware of the fateful part national rivalries have played in preventing those peoples from the realization of their common interests, which are overwhelming indeed in comparison to the interests that divide them. I feel, therefore, that the common initiative which four distinguished exiled agrarian leaders of eastern Europe took on the 4th of July 1947 deserves our appreciation and sympathetic backing. Mr. Nagy for Hungary, Mr. Dimitroff for Bulgaria, Mr. Macek for Croatia, and Mr. Gavrilovic for Yugoslavia proclaimed on that day the

formation of an International Democratic Peasant Union. Rumanian, Polish, Czech, and Slovak agrarian leaders endorsed their manifesto announcing the common aims of eastern European peasants.

It happened for the first time in the history of these countries that the leaders of the majorities agreed on a common program of cooperation and democracy. I warmly commend this courageous step and earnestly hope that our Government will grant to these distinguished representatives of truly democratic forces not only asylum but all the consideration and assistance that their just cause deserves.

Before concluding, I should like to make one more observation. After Munich we got accustomed to call the small countries which were let down by the Western Powers satellites. First there was some sorrow and understanding in the accent on that word, later we blamed and despised them. Now again we call them satellites, but instead of Hitler, the Politbureau is their overlord. Today we are full of regret that they may not attend the Paris Conference because they are satellites. Tomorrow we may blame them again for the same reason. But let us never forget our share of the responsibility for their becoming satellites again.

I am afraid that the people of eastern Europe must think that we are not interested in their fate. Although we vigorously voice our concern, we do not act accordingly. There are signs of increasing antitotalitarian resistance everywhere, but we definitely discourage them by talking big and doing little on their behalf.

If passivity is to be the policy of the United States, is a new form of appeasement, then let us say so. Let us tell them that we accept the Red split of Europe. If that is not the case, and I think that it must not be the case, then we have to let them know that we mean what we say, and that we say only what we mean. Then lack of imagination or of diplomatic know-how must not prevent us from the implementation of our policy. If we want to keep their hopes and their resistance alive, we must at least keep their case alive. If we fail, then the world is doomed to another and a more horrible holocaust. Who are the Chamberlains in our State Department?

OUR FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the inherent fallacy of our foreign economic policy is daily becoming more apparent. In my opinion by the time the next session of Congress is convened, we will find ourselves forced to throw it overboard.

Arithmetic will not permit the United States to engage in a so-called free trade policy. The recent legislation in regard to wool is just one of many similar items. Under our American system which is based on equal treatment for all groups in our economy we cannot afford to

sacrifice first our wool industry and then follow up with the sacrifice of our petroleum and mineral production, and so forth.

It is sometimes much easier to point out a fallacy by using a simple example affecting almost every section of the United States. I would like to point out what has happened in the case of fats and oils, the end result of much of our agricultural economy.

Because of the continuance of wartime controls and the lack of proper tariff protection, we have today the greatest dislocation in the price of fats and oils of any period in our history. In fact it is so severe that it represents a serious threat to our future economic welfare.

For example, in 1910 the retail price of lard was 15.8 cents per pound as compared to 22 cents at the present time. Corn was selling for 50 cents as compared to \$2 per bushel at the current market level. It ought to be self-evident that the farmer is not going to feed hogs if this situation is to continue.

The packing industry is absorbing much of the loss on lard through a higher price on choice cuts such as pork chops and hams. It is one of the principal reasons for the high meat prices.

The normal ratio of the price of pork chops and lard is approximately 2 to 1. In other words, lard should sell for one half the price of pork chops. During 1945 lard was retailing at 18.8 cents and pork chops at 37.1 cents. At the present time pork chops are 80 cents per pound and lard is 22 cents.

This dislocation in prices can be traced to the planning of the international food board and the men in charge of controls over exports and imports.

On one hand the Government refuses to permit allocations for the export of lard and on the other hand they permit an almost free flow of imports of vegetable oils which are now available at 11 cents per pound. They are sacrificing our own producers of fats and oils to gain a few cheap dollars for the nations which are exploiting the cheap labor of the Far East.

To some of you the matter may seem unimportant but a study of the situation will convince you otherwise. We use annually about 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils of all kinds. The effect of our foreign economic policy at the present time is causing a loss of at least 10 cents per pound on our own domestic fats and oils. This means a loss to the American farmer—North, South, East and West, of approximately \$1,000,000,000. With the seven times turn of farm income into national income it means that we are sustaining a loss of \$7,000,000,000 of national income because of our present foreign economic policies.

On one hand fats and oils are being kept from reaching other nations as exports and on the other hand we are buying fats and oils which they badly need.

It was a similar situation of cheap fats and oils from the Orient that started our farm prices downward in 1925. The low price for fats and oils finally forced a drop in the price of livestock and grains. A similar result will follow if present policies are continued.

To my friends in the South I would like to point out that the imports of the cheap vegetable oils is also affecting the price of cottonseed oil and peanut oil. In fact if we are not careful we will soon be forced to support the price of peanut oil and peanuts.

The wool problem which has as yet not been acted upon by the House after the President's veto of proper tariff protection, is similar to that of fats and oils. We cannot maintain a price for the American farmer on a free trade basis and the sooner the South, the Midwest and the West wake up to that fact the better it will be for all of us.

In promoting our present foreign economic policy we are deluding ourselves and the nations which are friendly to the United States. We cannot carry on with the present policy without forcing ourselves into national bankruptcy. Our first foundation for our own prosperity is to protect our domestic producers in their right to produce at the American level.

What right have we to expect to sell \$1,600 automobiles to the coolie labor which is producing the fats and oils at a wage of 20 cents per day in competition with our farmer?

A similar example is that of rubber. The price has dropped to 14 cents per pound and the international investors who own the plantations are rapidly convincing our State Department that we ought to discontinue the production of synthetic rubber so that they can continue to exploit the cheap labor of the Far East.

If we really wish to reciprocally trade we should pay them a proper price for the rubber we need, but we should not permit our own rubber industry to be sacrificed for the benefit of a few international capitalists.

Of course the lure of a cheap product has often caused us to sacrifice our own producer. The rubber from the Far East at 14 cents per pound is in reality high priced if properly analyzed. For example, if we pay American labor producing rubber \$1 per hour they can buy 4 pounds of rubber at 25 cents per pound with each hour of work. On the other hand, the worker in the rubber plantation receiving 50 cents per day cannot buy 4 pounds of rubber with a full day's work even though it sells for 14 cents per pound.

One of the fundamental rules of economics is that the producer is also the consumer and if we are going to trade for fats and oils, rubber, and so forth, produced by cheap labor than we will eventually find ourselves with a cheap market and unemployment at home.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION SHOULD BE ENACTED AT AN EARLY DATE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, those of us interested in Federal aid for education were delighted a few weeks ago when the Subcommittee on Education of the Labor and Education Committee favorably reported H. R. 2593, the bill filed by its chairman the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman EDWARD O.

McCOWEN. In view of the fact that many schools, particularly in rural areas, will be without teachers this fall, we hoped very earnestly that the bill would be favorably approved by the whole committee and passed through the Congress at this session. Apparently, however, the measure has been sidetracked and action on it will have to await until Congress reconvenes. In view of the urgency, let us hope that Federal aid for education may be considered in the event a special session is called, or in any event early in the next session of Congress. At least the Subcommittee on Education deserves high commendation for the splendid hearings and consideration it gave to this important matter.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for calling this very important legislation to the attention of the House. Perhaps it is too late to get action on it this session, but I am sure the gentleman will agree that there is no more important legislation facing the Congress today than the question of Federal aid for education.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly appreciate the observations of the gentleman. I know of his very earnest work in support of this legislation.

Education is important to every boy and girl in this country because it is the only means that they have for relating themselves to the extremely complex social and economic life that has developed out of a war-torn world. It is extremely important to the States and local communities because it is the major means that will enable the maximum development of their human and material resources. It is of utmost importance to the Nation in the maintenance of national security and the building of domestic prosperity. It is vital to the world because only through a well-enlightened people do we have any possibility of creating an enduring peace.

Complete equality of opportunity was the idealistic dream of our founding fathers. It has never materialized fully because we have never provided equality in the educational opportunity offered to all of our youth. Failure to take some positive and effective action on Federal aid to public education at this time would seem to be a tragic disregard and neglect of our primary resource—the youth of America. In many of America's less wealthy States children get one-third to one-half as many weeks of schooling as more fortunate children in wealthier States. The range of educational opportunity offered in this country is now as great as 60 to 1. Actually there are no less than 2,000,000 children in this country who live in areas sufficiently wealthy to spend 60 times the amount of money that can be afforded to provide the meager education offered to another 2,000,000 less fortunate children. This means that the social and economic opportunity of youth depends almost wholly upon the part of the country in which he is born. In the rural areas of

a poor State his chances for an education that will put him in a position to compete on an equal basis with those born under more fortunate circumstances is almost negligible. To me this is a most deplorable situation, in the world's richest Nation that has for so many years exemplified to the remaining nations of the world the value and the force of public education.

I have always thought that we lead the world in the realization of the power and force of public education, yet last year we spent only 1.5 percent of our total national income on education. During this same year Britain spent 3 percent of its total national income for education, while Russia spent 7.5 percent of its total national income for the development of its educational system. When we realize that Great Britain and Russia both learned of the value of educational expenditures from us we realize that we can no longer neglect to provide adequate support of America's public schools.

Today the United States is playing a leading role in world affairs as an aftermath to victory in war. We have emerged a more vigorous and energetic Nation than any other with a productive capacity that exceeds any the world has ever known. We are rapidly assuming a commanding lead in technological developments, science, and agriculture. Can we say the same about human welfare? Not so long as we continue to spend only 1.5 percent of our national income on the education of our future leaders in science, industry, and arts.

The simplification of communications throughout the world has given rise to a need for the future leaders of American political, economic, and social life to be able to take their place as world leaders as well as our leaders. Are we educating our young to such? Not when we discourage the normal recruitment of teachers by inadequate salaries. If you want teachers to come from the best of our population you will have to raise our standards. Not only is an attractive entering salary important but in order to keep the best teachers in the profession there must be a decent final maximum salary. It is inconceivable that a Nation as great as ours should relinquish its dominant place in world leadership by denying itself the best educational system in the world simply because of inadequate educational finance.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What is the recommended sum as far as Federal aid for education is concerned?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Taft bill and my bill anticipate that \$300,000,000 be appropriated each year to assure that every child in school should have at least \$40 spent on them. The McCowen bill, giving assistance to all of the States, would require a somewhat larger amount.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Just what does the gentleman think the chances are of getting that sum out of this Congress?

Mr. KEFAUVER. This is, of course, an economy Congress, and there is no chance in this session, but let us hope

it may be different in the next session. I may say this is not a gift. It is an investment in the youth of America which will yield high returns. I hope it will have support from both sides of the aisle. The gentleman, I know, has been greatly interested in this legislation.

I could use the time allotted to me wholly in citing to you existing conditions in American education that present what has been popularly termed "the crisis in education." Experts have presented statistics and other data to such an extent that it is unnecessary for me to go into detail in describing those conditions. The major cause of this crisis is a teacher shortage which has developed at a time when the demands upon the schools are such that a greatly increased teaching force is needed. This teacher shortage has been brought about by the influence of a number of factors. Unquestionably the first and most important of these factors is the low wage that has been paid teachers for a number of years. Many of our teachers are employed at salaries below that of school janitors, scrub women, garbage collectors, and bartenders. The average annual salary of teachers in my State in 1944-45 amounted to approximately \$1,300 and for the Nation as a whole only \$1,846. This is a condition that will no longer be tolerated by many teachers. It tends to undermine and destroy the efforts to stabilize teaching as a profession. I know the results of this appalling low salary condition because of the stream of personal correspondence and visits from school representatives that I have almost every day.

During the war the Federal Government reached into all corners of the country and into all walks of life for manpower to serve its wartime needs. In this emergency the teaching profession magnificently filled its quota. We found classroom teachers in every branch of the armed services on every battle front and serving the country in its every wartime need. But this in itself produced a terrific impact upon the schools, because many of these teachers learned that the advantages, financial and otherwise, in other fields of employment offered greater opportunity, and those whose love for teaching was not sufficiently strong to overcome the self-sacrifice necessary to go back to underpaid and overworked situations have left the profession for good. This situation has been termed the greatest vocational migration of history. Another highly significant factor comes from the pressure of extra population. In the 5 years following America's entry into World War II 13,000,000 babies were born. Some population experts had predicted only 4,000,000. This increase in population began to be felt in the schools last year as increased enrollments were reported from almost every State. Further increases were reported this year and as this bulge in child population moves upward the demands on the schools for increased numbers of teachers produces conditions that can result only in the disastrous disintegration of our American public schools unless steps are taken at once to alleviate them.

This disaster must not be permitted to happen. The economic strength and security of our Nation, the individual welfare of every citizen, depends more and more upon the educational ability of its citizenry. A significant study made by the education committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce points out that the level of educational attainment of the adult population is a determining factor in the level of income of the country itself. It has been estimated that if the average level of the adult population of 11 of the Southern States having lowest educational status could be increased by only 1 year, which would mean an average of 8½ years of schooling, the increased productivity thereby in these 11 States would raise the total income of the Nation by approximately \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Is there any way the gentleman knows of whereby each child in the United States, regardless of his location, may have an opportunity that is the same as or at least similar to that of children in other places, without Federal aid?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I know of no other system, and unless some assistance to education is given through Federal aid, I know that in some States we are always going to have areas where children will not have equality of opportunity. I think in the United States they are entitled to that. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman to this discussion.

Due to the mobility of our population, and especially of our youth, illiteracy is not merely a local liability, but a national one as well. The declining birth rate in all our major cities and the increasing birth rate in rural areas means that as population pressures are brought to bear upon the youth of low economic areas, the migratory trend is toward the city. This is one of the reasons why the removal of inequalities of educational opportunity is a major responsibility of the Nation and consequently the Federal Government.

During the operation of the selective service system nearly one-half of the rejections were for educational or health defects. Thus, at a time when our Nation had its greatest need for healthy and intelligent manpower, it is estimated that the equivalent of no less than 20 combat divisions were unable to serve the Nation because of illiteracy and educational disqualification.

There is no doubt of the keen Nation-wide interest in the teacher shortage and the critical problems of the public schools. Many editorials have appeared in newspapers over the Nation. Frequent articles have been presented in national periodicals. Even the news reels and the radio have presented to the people what is happening to their schools. It is unfortunate that this partial breakdown of the school system was ever forced to public attention through a series of teacher strikes. To me it is disgraceful that this great country should permit our

public school situation to become so desperate that teachers should have to resort to such extreme measures.

I am convinced that only through Federal aid to supplement State and local effort can the future soundness of our public education be assured. The least we can do is to give the benefits set up in the Taft bill or in H. R. 2138, which I am sponsoring, to the educational system of the Nation. These bills would establish a minimum program which would enable the underprivileged areas of the Nation to assure a minimum expenditure of \$40 per year for each school child. At the same time these bills give every protection to the rights of the States and local communities in the supervision of their schools.

America's deep faith in her free public school system as a sound foundation for our democracy is being put to a severe test at this time. The welfare of the children of the Nation and of the future of our country demands early passage of an education bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include newspaper articles in each.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and include some articles.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3587. An act to provide for the establishment of a temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board; and

H. R. 4106. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenue of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 323. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts;

S. 512. An act to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands;

S. 516. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina;

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1220. An act to transfer jurisdiction of certain lands comprising a portion of Acadia National Park, Maine, from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1348. An act to provide for the addition of certain reversioned Oregon & California Railroad grant lands to the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1497. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916;

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; and

S. 1519. An act to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 24, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

951. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (previously referred to the Committee on the Judiciary).

952. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for consideration of legislation which will provide sufficient funds for the presentation to Elire of a statue of Commodore John Barry (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

953. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to vest the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with the control and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Armory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

954. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to June 30, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

955. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the furnishing of an official residence to the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

956. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to increase the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

967. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

968. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 (d) of Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, the information that there were no contracts entered into or modified under authority of Public Law 46 during the period beginning April 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

969. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

970. A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Second Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIZLEY: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 3938. A bill relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4309. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to "Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property," so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply. Interim report filed pursuant to House Resolution 58, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JAVITS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4186. A bill to prohibit and punish the unauthorized use of the official seal, emblem, and name of the United Nations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1043). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4212. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONKMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4330. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 1045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 907. An act to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursement officers of the Treasury Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feress; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:
H. R. 4335. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEARHART:
H. R. 4336. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):
H. R. 4337. A bill to provide tax relief for income earned over a period of years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):
H. R. 4338. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:
H. R. 4339. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to require all members of the Communist Party to register under such act, to provide that all printed matter distributed by such members shall be clearly labeled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:
H. R. 4340. A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:
H. R. 4341. A bill to amend Public Law 168, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4342. A bill to amend Public Law 447, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Military Academy to be

given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics other than the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAVENNER:
H. R. 4343. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4344. A bill to increase the allowances paid to certain enlisted men of the armed forces retired prior to July 1, 1942; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. R. 4345. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions in the field service of the Post Office Department for which examinations were taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:
H. Res. 324. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to have printed additional copies of hearings held before a special subcommittee relative to the agricultural and economic problems of the Cotton Belt; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa introduced a bill (H. R. 4346) for the relief of Charles Cowden Watson, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 16, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, who knowest the way that we take, we would commit ourselves again into Thy safe and holy keeping. Help us to remember that the steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord. Renew in us a sense of Thy presiding presence in this Chamber, as Thy servants address themselves to the crowded calendar of another day. If any of us are pressed down with some personal anxiety or private sorrow or distress of soul, encourage us to cast all our cares over upon Thee, Thou great burden bearer, that with freedom of spirit and release of care we may devote our thoughts and our energies to the public concerns.

These mercies we ask, with Thy blessing upon the President and the people of the United States, and Thy children throughout the world, in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the